

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Monday, 13th August 1956.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Government Estate, Mount Road, at nine of the clock, Mr. Speaker (THE HON. SRI N. GOPALA MENON) in the Chair.

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS.

Ownership of Kachcha tivu in Palk Straits

* 61 Q.—SRI N. K. PALANISAMY: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any communication recently from the Union Government regarding the ownership of Kachcha tivu in Palk Straits; and

(b) if so, the reply given by the State Government to the Union Government?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) A reply has been sent to the Union Government furnishing the particulars required by them, but which cannot for obvious reasons be divulged at present.

SRI N. K. PALANISAMY: May I know, Sir, whether, before sending the report to the Central Government, any investigation was made, and how that Kachcha tivu was handed over to the Ceylon Government? May I further know, Sir, whether the Government wrote to the Central Government to restore that island to our country?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: Yes, Sir. All the facts were enquired into, and a report has been submitted to the Union Government. I do not think the assumption of the hon. Member that this *tivu* was handed over to the Ceylon Government is correct.

Snakes in Gingee sub-jail

* 62 Q.—SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN (on behalf of Sri K. Aranganathan): Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any reports in 1954 and 1955 that snakes frequent the sub-jail at Gingee; and

(b) if so, the steps taken to prevent the same?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: (a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

[13th August 1956]

Tax on diesel oil

* 63 Q.—SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN (on behalf of Sri K. Aranganathan) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state with reference to budget speech for the year 1956–57, the stage at which the proposals to enhance the tax on diesel oil stands at present?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : The proposal to enhance the tax on diesel oil from 1½ annas to 4 annas per gallon has been deferred for the present consequent on the increase made by the Government of India by four annas of the excise duty on the same article.

SRI K. PARTHASARATHY : Are the Government aware, Sir, that, thinking there will be an enhancement of the tax, dealers have been charging higher rates for this oil supplied by them in April and May?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Not on account of the proposal made by us to levy an increased sales tax. But it may have been on account of the increased excise duty.

SRI S. RAMALINGAM : இந்த வரியை நம்முடைய ராஜ்ய அரசாங்கம் போட்டால் நம்முடைய வருமானம் அதிகமாகும். ஆனால் மத்திய அரசாங்கம் இந்த வரியைப் போட்டு அதிகமான வருமானத்தைப் பெறுகிறார்கள். ஆகவே மத்திய அரசாங்கம் வரி போடுவதை நிறுத்திக் கொண்டு நம்முடைய ராஜ்ய அரசாங்கம் போடுவதற்கு ஏதாவது ஏற்பாடு செய்யப்படுமா?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : மத்திய சர்க்கார் விதிக்கும் வரியிலிருந்து பங்கு கேட்டு நாம் எழுதியிருக்கிறோம்.

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : மத்திய சர்க்கார் போடக்கூடிய வரியிலிருந்து பங்கு கேட்பதைவிட நாமே இதன்மேல் விற்பனை வரியை அதிகப்படுத்தலாமா என்பது ஆலோசிக்கவேண்டிய விஷயம். டீசல் எண்ணெயை உபயோகப்படுத்துவதன் மூலம் பஸ் முதலாளிகளுக்குச் சிக்கனம் ஏற்படுகிறது, லாபமும் அதிகரிக்கிறது. விவசாயத்திற்கு உபயோகப்படுத்தும் எண்ணெய்க்கு மட்டும் வரியிலிருந்து விதிவிலக்கு அளித்துவிட்டு, பஸ்களுக்கு உபயோகப்படுத்தும் எண்ணெய்க்கு விற்பனை வரி போடும் யோசனையை சர்க்கார் ஆலோசிப்பார்களா?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : விவசாயத்திற்காக டீசல் எண்ணெய் வாங்குபவர்கள் அதை விவசாயத்திற்கே உபயோகப்படுத்துகிறார்களா அல்லது பஸ்களுக்கு உபயோகப்படுத்துவார்களா என்பதை முதலிலேயே நிர்ணயிப்பது மிகவும் கஷ்டம். பஸ்களைப் பொறுத்த வரை இப்பொழுது நாம் அதிக வரி போட்டிருப்பதற்காக மத்திய சர்க்காரிலே ஒரு மசோதா வந்திருப்பதையும் கனம் அங்கத்தினர்கள் பார்த்திருக்கலாம். அதற்கு வேண்டிய நடவடிக்கை எடுப்பதில் இப்பொழுது கஷ்டம் ஏற்படக்கூடிய நிலைமையில் இருக்கிறோம்.

SRI S. DAIVASIGAMONEY : Sir, have our Government protested against the Central Government levying this tax because it will be depriving us of a source of revenue? Have our Government suggested to the Central Government that they (Madras Government) will be prepared to give a part of the earnings from this tax to them?

13th August 1956]

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : The Central Government are entitled to levy the excise duty, and we cannot take any legitimate objection to that. We are entitled to levy sales tax. Unfortunately it happened that this year they also levied a tax of four annas excise duty per gallon and we also contemplated the increased sales tax on this oil. This would have worked hardship. That is why we thought we should not impose our tax but on the other hand write to them asking them to share the proceeds of that tax with the State Governments.

Publication of rules and notifications in Hindi

* 64 Q.—

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. Member Sri P. Rangaswami Reddiar is not in his seat. The question and the answer will be printed in the proceedings.

SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any proposal to publish all rules and notifications in Hindi; and

(b) if so, from what date?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : (a) No, Sir.

(b) The question does not arise.

Development of Yercaud as a summer resort

* 65 Q.—**SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have any scheme for developing Yercaud in Shevaroy Hills, Salem district, as a place of summer resort; and

(b) if so, when it is likely to be executed?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : (a) Yercaud was recommended to the Government of India for development as a tourist centre under the Second Five-Year Plan.

(b) The Government of India have however included this centre only in Part III of their Plan, which includes schemes to be financed entirely by the State Government concerned. This Government have not yet taken up any such schemes for consideration.

Absorption of retrenched workers

* 66 Q.—**SRI C. KANDASAMY :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any memorandum dated 30th of December 1955, from one Sri S. Krishnamoorthy for and on behalf of the ex-employees of Vummudi Guruswami Chetti

[13th August 1956]

and Company, Madras, for re-absorbing all the workers, who have been retrenched, in the new concern Vummiyars' Manufacturers, Limited; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The request in the memorandum was considered by the Government and it was found that as the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Madras, in the dispute was in force only till 23rd July 1948, the management could not be asked to absorb all the workers and that the workers were not also entitled to any gratuity, as the award did not contain any direction to that effect. Sri S. Krishna-moorthi was informed accordingly.

* 67 Q.—SRI C. KANDASAMY : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether any dispute is pending disposal in connection with re-absorption of workers retrenched due to a strike in 1951 in Messrs. Spencer and Company, Madras; and

(b) if so, the details of the same?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

Registration of handlooms

* 68 Q.—SRI N. K. PALANISAMY : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state whether it is a fact that the Government have issued orders to get all the handlooms in the State registered during June 1956?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : The Government of India have issued an order on 8th May 1956 that no person shall, after the commencement of that order, use or have in his possession any handloom unless it is registered and registration certificate issued in respect thereof is in force. The Director of Handlooms is taking steps to register the handlooms in this State in pursuance of this order.

SRI N. K. PALANISAMY : Sir, in registering handloom weavers, they are registering only house owners and not the tenant weavers in the house or the wage labourers for weaving in that house. Therefore, may I know whether the Government will instruct their officers who are registering these men to register all weavers including the wage labourers and tenant weavers?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I would suggest to the hon. Member to give this in writing to me so that I may look into it.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : Sir, does this registration imply that no further licence for registration of handlooms will be allowed after a particular date?

13th August 1956]

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : No, Sir. The registration is proposed to be undertaken with a view to have complete data for further planning with reference to permanent habitation of handloomers.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : Sir, is the Hon. Minister aware that the Central Government in their notification asking for registration of handloomers did not give the reasons for the sudden order and, as a result of that, there is a lot of agitation and apprehension among the handloom weavers? I would like to know what the proposals of the Government to allay those apprehensions are.

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I have just now given the main reason behind this proposal to have all handloomers registered. This Government are taking steps to explain to the handloom weavers how this registration would not affect them in the least and why in their own interest this registration is undertaken. We are taking every step to allay all fears and misgivings on the part of the handloom weavers.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : Will the Hon. Minister consider the desirability of calling a representative conference of the handloom weavers from various States, discuss with them the whole problem—for example, the State Handloom Board can be taken into confidence—and try to evolve a proper method for registering the handloomers? Because, I know that there is a lot of agitation now among the handloom weavers.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I propose to have what the Government propose to explain in detail printed in Tamil and circulated widely among the handloom weavers to enable them to understand what exactly the Government are doing. If necessary, the Government will consider whether they should call a conference of representatives to explain the position further.

SRI S. DAIVASIGAMONEY : Sir, there are master weavers and ordinary weavers working under the master weavers. There are independent handloom weavers having looms in their own houses. Is the Hon. Minister aware that it will be a great hardship for these handloom weavers if they were asked to register themselves? May I know whether any officer has been appointed for the purpose of registering them or whether the handloom weavers have to go to a particular office and get themselves registered? Is there any fee for registration? Is there a penal clause for non-registration and if so, will it not create considerable hardship to the handloom weavers?

9-10
a.m.

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : The Government will then and there go into the various questions raised by the hon. Member to see that the handloom weavers are not put to any difficulty in the matter.

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR : The Hon. Minister was saying that a leaflet will be published for explaining to the weavers

[18th August 1956]

the implications of the scheme. May I know whether such a leaflet will be published in Malayalam also so that the Malayalee weavers may be benefited?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : If the scheme comes into effect before 1st November, certainly, it will be published in Malayalam and Kannada also.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : It is a well-known fact that the handloom trade was a bit remunerative sometime back, but it is not giving good returns at the present time. As a result of this, many people who were depending upon handloom weaving have now ceased to be weavers and have dismantled their handlooms. Will the Government take steps to register them also so that their case may not go unheard if and when the Government at a later date consider the question of introducing control?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : The hon. Member with all his experience is not exactly correct when he says that the handloom trade is not paying now. I may tell the hon. Member that the handlooms do pay better now than they were doing sometime back. If some of the handloom weavers have dismantled their looms, certainly, there is the programme of expansion, and when the co-operative societies invite all handloom weavers to get into the co-operative fold, there should not be any difficulty for them to do so. So, I may tell my friend, Sri Vinayakam, that even if there were handloom weavers who have dismantled their looms, there would be no difficulty in their coming into the co-operative fold. That would fit in with our expansion programme.

SRI S. DAIVASIGAMONEY : What will happen to the handloom weaver who does not register himself? Is it left to the option of the individual handloom weavers to register themselves as handloom weavers?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Sir, there should be no difficulty at all for these weavers to register themselves. The Government will extend all facilities to them in the matter. Therefore, the hon. Member need not raise unnecessary apprehensions in the matter which might confuse the weavers themselves.

SRI K. P. GOPALAN : May I know whether, along with the registration of the looms, will the Government consider the question of registering the handloom weavers, their names and their services?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I may tell the hon. Member that it is not covered by the Government of India's order that I had referred to.

SRI P. KUNHIRAMA KIDAV : May I know whether the order refers to pit looms also?

13th August 1956]

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : It refers to all handlooms.

SRI G. GOVINDAN : கைத்தறி துணி நிறைய தேங்கிக் கிடப்பதாகவும், அதனால் கைத்தறித் தொழிலாளர்கள் பாதிக்கப்பட்டிருப்பதாகவும் சொல்லப்படுகிறது. ஆகையால் எம்.எல்.ஏ.-க்கள் கைத்தறித் துணியையே அவசியம் வாங்கிக் கட்டுவதற்கு சர்க்கார் ஏற்பாடு செய்வார்களா ?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : இந்தத் திருப்பணியை சர்க்கார் எடுத்துக்கொள்ளுவதைவிட கனம் அங்கத்தினரைப் போன்றவர்கள் எடுத்துக்கொள்ளலாம்.

SRI S. RAMALINGAM : கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் தங்களைப் பதிவு செய்துக்கொள்ளுவதின் மூலமாக அவர்களுக்குச் சர்க்கார் என்னென்ன சலுகைகள் கொடுக்கும் ?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : If any specific instances where the weavers find it difficult to have their looms registered are given, the Government will examine them.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : At the present moment, the Government communique makes it clear that the registration will be purely on a voluntary basis. Suppose a weaver does not come forward to register his loom, what will be his fate? Will he be penalized for non-registration? Will the Government take steps to help the handloom weavers under such circumstances?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Sir, I have already stated that the Government would extend all facilities to enable the handloom weavers to register their looms. At the same time, the Government will also see that they are not put to any difficulty.

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : பாக்டரிகளில் தனிப்பட்ட மாஸ்டர் விவர்களுக்குச் சொந்தமான தறிகள் பதிவு செய்யப்படும்பொழுது, தொழிலாளர்களின் பேரில் பதிவு செய்யப்படுகிறதா உல்லது பாக்டரி சொந்தக் காரர்கள் மாஸ்டர் விவர்களின் பேரில் பதிவு செய்யப்படுகிறதா என்று அறிய விரும்புகிறேன்.

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : According to the information available with me, I believe, the registration will be on the basis of ownership of the loom.

SRI S. DAIVASIGAMONEY : May I know whether the communiqué regarding registration is only a sort of suggestion to the weaver or whether it is compulsory?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : After the registration is completed, the weaver is expected not to have a loom which does not come under the registration.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : May I tell the Hon. Minister that the Central Government's order asking for the registration of the handlooms says that the looms should be registered in the name of those who are in possession of the handloom? So, the question of ownership does not come in. May I also point out that because of the Madras Government interpreting 'possession' as 'ownership',

[13th August 1956]

a lot of complications are created? Will the Government therefore see to it that they properly interpret the Government of India's order?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM: Sir, the Government of Madras are not interested in giving a particular interpretation. But, sometimes possession would depend on ownership also. (Sri P. Ramamurthi: Not necessarily.) I agree, not necessarily. All those things will be taken into account when the looms are registered.

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM: இந்தத் தகராருக்கு இடமில்லாமல் தரிகளை ரிஜிஸ்டர் செய்யும்பொழுது தரிகளில் டைலை செய்யக்கூடிய தொழிலாளர்களையும் சேர்த்து பதிவு செய்ய சர்க்கார் நடவடிக்கை எடுக்குமா?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM: Sir, the Government will examine that suggestion also.

Conversion of handlooms into powerlooms

* 69 Q.—SRI N. K. PALANISAMY: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether this Government have received any communication from the Centre during June 1956 with regard to issuing of licences for new textile mills in the State; and

(b) whether there is any proposal to convert the handlooms into powerlooms in the State?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM: (a) No, Sir.

(b) A scheme has been formulated by the Government of India for the installation of powerlooms by handloom weavers on a co-operative basis. The scheme is under the consideration of this Government.

SRI N. K. PALANISAMY: On the floor of the House, the Hon. Minister had stated that he categorically opposed the introduction of powerlooms in the State. May I know how the State Government have now agreed to the Central Government's proposal to introduce powerlooms in the State?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM: The attitude of this Government with reference to the Government of India's proposal is that the specific proposal is not at all inconsistent with the policy which I have announced in this House sometime ago. I believe the hon. Leader of the Opposition has given notice of a resolution on this matter and I hope on the coming non-official day it may be taken up. Then, I think I could have sufficient time to explain better the implications behind the proposal of the Government of India.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP: What is the attitude of this Government to the policy suggested by the Central Government?

13th August 1956]

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Sir, it is not a question of policy, it is a question of programme and this Government are not opposed to that programme.

SRI N. K. PALANISAMY : Suppose a powerloom is introduced about 20 handloom weavers will have no employment. They will be unemployed. Since the output from a powerloom is said to be 150 yards a day and that from an ordinary handloom is only 6 yards, 20 weavers will have to face unemployment. Considering this fact and the fact that the Handloom Board is also opposed to this, will the Government take steps in the matter so that the interests of the ordinary handloom weavers are not affected?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Whatever may be the programme undertaken by the Government of India, this Government have given, more than once, a categorical assurance that on account of this programme or any policy pursued by the Government, not one handloom weaver would be affected, not one pie of the wages of the handloom weaver would be affected. The Government undertakes to see that the handloom weaver is not affected in any way. I may also tell the hon. Member that according to the claims made by the leaders of the handloom weavers, there are 5.6 lakhs of handlooms in this State. According to the statistics available with regard to handlooms in the co-operative societies, there are 157,000 handlooms under the co-operative societies. So far as the programme relating to this State is concerned, the proposal is to introduce power for reasons which have been explained and which I will explain in detail at the proper time when there is sufficient time. The proposal is to have about 3,000 powerlooms introduced in this year, and it is proposed to introduce another 3,000 or so next year. Thus, it will be seen that there will be only 6,000 to 7,000 powerlooms out of the 5.6 lakhs of looms as claimed by the leaders of handloom weavers.

SRI K. R. NALLASIVAM : கைத்தறிக்குப் பதிலாக விசைத் தறியைப் புகுத்துவதன் மூலமாக வேலையில்லாத திண்டாட்டம் ஏற்படுமென்று நெசவாளர்கள் பீதி அடைந்திருக்கிறார்கள். அப்படி அவர்களுக்கு வேலையில்லாத திண்டாட்டம் ஏற்படாமலிருப்பதற்கு சர்க்கார் உத்தரவாதம் கொடுக்கின்றார்களா ?

9-20
a.m.

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : சர்க்கார் உத்தரவாதம் கொடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள் என்று சொன்னேன். அதோடு கைத்தறியாளர்களிடம் நேரிடையாகச் சென்று அவர்களிடையே உள்ள பீதியைப் போக்குவதற்கு சர்க்கார் நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள்.

Sale of handloom cloth in foreign countries

* 70 Q.—**SRI N. K. PALANISAMY :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state the steps taken by Government to increase the sale of handloom cloth in foreign countries during the year 1956?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : The export of handloom cloth for sale in foreign countries is not the primary concern

[13th August 1956]

of the State Government. A scheme formulated by the Government of India for the purpose is in operation and the Madras State Handloom Weavers' Co-operative Society are the agents of the Government of India in the matter. The scheme has been in progress since February 1954.

SRI N. K. PALANISAMY : Sir, I find from the newspapers that handloom goods worth Rs. 76 lakhs have been ordered in America. So, have this Government represented to the Government of India to open an emporium in America?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I am sorry I do not have the details as to what is being done with reference to the demand for our handloom cloth in America. Let the hon. Member put a separate question.

SRI A. M. RATHNASWAMY : Sir, certain officers were deputed by our Government to visit certain foreign markets. May I know what their reactions are after visiting those countries in regard to the sale of handloom cloth and whether there is any good prospect of capturing foreign markets?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I may tell the hon. Member that there is demand for our handloom cloth in other countries. Regarding other details, I would like to have notice.

SRI S. RAMALINGAM : சமீபத்தில் கணம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் வெளி நாடுகளில் சுற்றுப்பிரயாணம் செய்தபொழுது அங்கு நமது கைத்தறித் துணியை விற்பனை செய்வதற்கும், அதற்குத் தகுந்த மார்க்கட் கண்டு பிடிப்பதற்கும் வேண்டிய நடவடிக்கை எடுத்தார்களா என்று அறிய விரும்புகிறேன்.

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : இது விஷயமாக மத்திய சர்க்காரின் சார்பாக ஒரு உத்தியோகஸ்தர் வெளி நாடுகளுக்கு சமீபத்தில் போயிருக்கிறார். நான் என்னுடைய சுற்றுப்பிரயாணத்தின் பொழுது இதுபற்றி கவனிக்கவில்லை. கவனிக்கக்கூடிய சந்தர்ப்பமும் இல்லை.

Renovation of temples

* 71 Q.—**SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN** (on behalf of Sri K. Aranganathan) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments and Transport be pleased to state—

(a) whether any improvement and repairs are being done to the ancient temples;

(b) whether the Commissioner for Religious Endowments has ever visited the historic temple at Singavaram, Gingee taluk; and

(c) the steps taken to improve and repair the Sri Ranganathar temple at Singavaram?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : (a) Yes.

(b) It is presumed that the reference is to the Sri Ranganathar temple at Singavaram. The Commissioner had visited this temple on 1st December 1955.

13th August 1956]

(c) None, because of want of funds. Action is being taken to appoint non-hereditary trustees for the temple who are expected to see to the repairs and improvements.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : It would be a welcome feature if proper repairs are effected to the ancient temples but on the other hand most of the non-well-informed trustees spoil the ancient sculptural achievements by white-washing and colour-washing sculptures. Therefore, will the Hon. Minister issue orders that these trustees or the men in power should not spoil those idols and sculptures?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : The hon. Member is always fond of indulging in vague allegations. I request him to suggest to me a concrete example where I could take action. Further, I do not think that the hon. Member's question arises out of this particular question which relate to temples in the Gingee taluk.

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN : May I draw the pointed attention of the Hon. Minister to the desirability of effecting repairs to this temple because that is an historic temple where the God is supposed to be powerful. Sir, when Raja Desinghu wanted to battle with the Nawab of Carnatic, he asked for permission from this God who refused and still when Raja Desinghu proceeded with his plan, the God was supposed to have cursed him. Thereafter when he went to battle, he was defeated and killed at the hands of the Nawab of Carnatic. So, will the Government take a lesson from it and improve this temple? They may also seek advice from this God regarding any difficult problem that they have to face.

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : There are equally important temples in other places also. I agree that it may be a historical one but we have got to see that "Tirupani" is performed and if the non-hereditary trustees are appointed, I think the whole problem will solve itself.

SRI V. K. RAMASWAMI MUDALIAR : There are many temples in the State which are in a state of disrepair and I understand that the Government have taken up only certain temples for immediate repairs. Will the Hon. Minister tell us the basis on which only selected temples are taken up for repairs and the priority in which they are taken up?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : Only those ancient temples about which hymns were sung by Nayanars and Alwars are being taken up now. Funds do not permit at present to take up some more temples. If funds are available, the Government will give priority to the temples which require immediate repairs.

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR : Sir, before the attainment of independence for our country, the foreigners were not interested in the renovation of the old historical temples. Also in

[13th August 1956]

Malabar when Tippu was in power, so many important temples were demolished and some of them are even now in a dilapidated condition. For instance, the Kuruvannil temple in the Narath village, the Thaliyil temple in Andur village and the Chalari temple in Cheleri village require immediate repairs. So, will the Government be pleased to conduct an enquiry into the matter and see whether any of them are worth renovation?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : The original question relates to a temple in the Gingee taluk. If the hon. Member puts a separate question, I will answer it.

SRI A. M. RATHNASWAMY : I understand that there are a large number of Harijan temples which require renovation since they are in a dilapidated condition but they have no income available. May I know whether any applications have been made by those who have temples in the Harijan slums and if so, whether any assistance has been given to those temples for renovation?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : There is no difference between Harijan temples and other temples. Temples are temples and we do not differentiate between temples in the Harijan quarters and the temples in other places. As I said, while attention will be paid in due course to those temples which are situated in the slum areas, immediate attention is being paid to such of the temples about which songs were sung by Nayanars and Alvars. So, just now it is not possible for the Government, with the limited resources, to spend on repairs of all temples. We have got a programme and we will carry it out according to schedule. We have also got to see that the provisions of the concerned Act are strictly followed.

9-30
a.m.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : Sir, the Government and the trustees have no time except to figure in Courts as parties in writ petitions and have no time to carry out improvements and repairs to temples. May I know what effective steps the Government propose to take to avoid such a state of affairs?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : In all cases relating to all departments, officers are engaged in Court work and I do not know why this remark is directed against this department only.

SRI K. R. VISWANATHAN : Even though there is a provision to divert the surplus funds of big temples for renovating small temples, the Government are not in a position to compel the trustees of big temples to divert the surplus funds of the temples under their charge for purposes of renovation of smaller temples. Will the Government come forward with a comprehensive legislation giving them powers to compel the trustees of big temples to divert their surplus funds for purposes of renovation of small temples?

13th August 1956]

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : Owing to the recent decision of the High Court on the matter, we cannot divert. The Government have been forbidden from doing so.

SRI S. DAIVASIGAMONEY : In view of the fact that our State Government is a secular one and in view of the fact that our Government have got the funds of all the temples in the State, is it fair on the part of the Government to discriminate between temples of Alwars and Nayanmars and ordinary temples and give priority to the former in respect of effectiving improvements and carrying out repairs? May I also know whether it is not necessary that as and when temples need repair it should be carried out immediately?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : It is not a question of taking all the temples for carrying out repairs. With the limited finances that are at the disposal of the Government for this purpose of carrying out repairs, we have got only to select a few temples. We cannot divert the surplus funds of big temples for work connected with smaller temples because the High Court has considered the provision relating to such transfers as 'invalid'. Therefore, with the limited funds we have at our disposal, we have to draw a list of priority and there is no particular prejudice against any particular temple.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : Sir, on a matter of personal explanation. While answering my question the Hon. Minister was pleased to say that I am making only vague or general allegations. I would like to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister to the first part of the question which deals with only a general matter. Is the Hon. Minister aware of the fact that in temples built by the Pallava Dynasty in Conjeevaram, Tirukazukundram and Mahabalipuram most of the sculptural works for which those temples are very famous are being spoiled by the respective trustees of those temples or by some others in power by colour-washing or white-washing with the result that after some years of colour-washing or white-washing the fineness of the stone-cuttings in those temples is being lost. In view of the fact that such a wrong method is being pursued by the trustees, will the Government even if they cannot better these sculptural or architectural work in those temples, at least issue instructions to see that these works are not spoiled by white-washing or colour-washing?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : White-washing wherever it is necessary without spoiling the sculptural or architectural beauty of the temples could have been undertaken by those in charge of the temples with the help of temple funds or by private individuals who are very much interested in the improvement of temples. But the Government are taking particular care to see that the ancient monuments, sculptural and architectural beauties which are really intended to be preserved are being maintained.

[13th August 1956]

Hindu Religious Shrines and Endowments

* 72 Q.—SRI N. K. PALANISAMY: Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments and Transport be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any proposal to bring in legislation to divert the incomes of Hindu Religious Shrines and Endowments to finance the Second Five-Year Plan in this State; and

(b) whether the State Government have received any communication from the Centre in the matter during the year 1956?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN: (a) This Government have no such proposal.

(b) A communication was received in 1955 (not in 1956) from the Government of India, Ministry of Education, asking for the views of this Government on the question of utilizing a part of the income of religious and charitable institutions for financing educational schemes under the Second Five-Year Plan. A similar communication was received from the Planning Commission also in the same year on the question of regulating on All-India basis, the use of the funds available with religious and charitable trusts.

SRI N. K. PALANISAMY: May I know why the Government are against the utilization of the funds of the Religious Shrines and Endowments for financing the Second Five-Year Plan and other activities?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN: Because the legal provisions are against it, we cannot do so.

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN: Have the Government examined as to the amount that would be available from the funds of the Religious Shrines and Endowments which can be diverted for financing the Second Five-Year Plan?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN: The question does not arise.

SRI S. RAMALINGAM: சட்டம் குறுக்கே நிற்பதாக மந்திரி அவர்கள் சொன்னார்கள். கோயில்களுக்கும், மடங்களுக்கும் இருக்கக் கூடிய சொத்துக்களிலிருந்து ஏராளமான வருமானம் வருகிறது. அது பல சமயங்களில் துர்விநியோகம் செய்யப்படுகிறது என்று பொது மக்களிடத்திலே ஒரு எண்ணம் ஏற்பட்டுக்கொண்டிருக்கிறது. ஆகவே, அதிலிருந்து வரக் கூடிய வருமானத்திலிருந்து கல்விக்காவது அவர்கள் செலவிடுவதற்கு சட்டத்தை எந்த எந்த விதத்தில் திருத்தியமைக்க முடியுமோ அந்த விதத்தில் திருத்துவதற்கு சர்க்கார் நடவடிக்கை எடுப்பார்களா?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN: சட்டத்தைத் திருத்தியமைத்தோம். ஆனால் ஹைகோர்ட்டில் அது செல்லாது என்று சொல்லி விட்டார்கள்.

13th August 1956]

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP: May I know whether the communication received from the Central Government was only with reference to Hindu Religious Shrines and Endowments or was it with reference with Religious Shrines and Charitable Endowments in general?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN: I do not have the particular information here but I know that it is with regard to religious institutions.

SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI: The Hon. Minister has been telling this House repeatedly that the High Court decision is against such utilization. May I know whether the Hon. Minister will inform the House very clearly whether the Government approve the principle of the suggestion, namely, the diversion of the funds for educational purposes and if they approve will it not be possible for them to have the Act amended to give effect to the principle?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN: The Government propose to bring in a comprehensive legislation in due course.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP: The Hon. Minister stated that the Government made such a provision which was declared invalid by the High Court. That was so because it related specially to Hindu Religious Shrines and Endowments. If a provision is enacted that the surplus funds of all religious institutions without excluding the institutions of any denomination or caste could be diverted, I am sure that it will be declared valid. Will the Government take such a step to utilize the funds of all religious institutions irrespective of the fact whether they belong to Hindus or Christians?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN: We will await the action of the Government of India in this matter.

*Extension of service to the Chief Engineer (General),
Public Works Department*

* 73 Q.—**SRI K. MADHAVAN NAMBIAR** (on behalf of Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar): Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state whether the Government have granted any extension of service to the Chief Engineer (General), Public Works Department, and if so, the reasons therefor?

THE HON. SRI R. SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI: No, Sir.

Ticketless travel in Government buses

* 74 Q.—**SRI N. K. PALANISAMY**: Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments and Transport be pleased to state—

(a) the steps taken by the Government to check ticketless travel in buses of the Government Transport; and

[13th August 1956]

(b) whether excess fare is collected from the ticketless travellers?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : (a) Checking Inspectors are posted on line to check ticket irregularities both in the City and mufassal routes. Traffic Superintendents, Traffic Managers and Traffic Inspectors also conduct surprise checks. The conductors have strict instructions to complete the issue of tickets before passing each fare-stage to prevent ticketless travel.

(b) The answer is in the negative.

SRI N. K. PALANISAMY : Now, Sir, if a passenger does not take out a ticket the concerned conductor of the bus in which the passenger is travelling is taken to task. May I know whether the Government will take steps to see that the passenger is fined if he is not in possession of a valid ticket and adopt such a procedure which is followed in the railways?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : Unlike in the railways, there is no legal provision to compel the Government to take such action.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : Is it not a fact that ticketless travel has almost been put an end to after the introduction of the flying squads who are efficiently tackling this problem?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : Yes, Sir.

SRI M. PALANIYANDI : பஸ்களில் பிரயாணம் செய்பவர்களில் அநேகர் டிக்கட் வாங்காமலிருப்பதற்குக் காரணம், பஸ்கள் பெரும்பாலும் நீளமாக இருப்பதும், 70, 80 பிரயாணிகள் வரையில் ஏற்றிக் கொண்டு போவதும், ஒரே கண்டக்டர் டிக்கட் கொடுக்கவேண்டியிருப்பதும் தான் என்று நான் நினைக்கிறேன். இரண்டு கண்டக்டர்கள் போடப்பட வேண்டுமென்ற யோசனை கவனிக்கப்படும் என்று ஒரு ஆண்டுக்கு முன்பாகவே மத்திய அவர்கள் சொல்லியிருக்கிறார். ஆகவே, ஒவ்வொரு பஸ்ஸுக்கும் இரண்டு கண்டக்டர்களை நியமித்தால் பஸ்களில் டிக்கட்டில்லாப் பிரயாணம் நீங்கிவிடும்.

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : நாங்கள் சிறிய பஸ்கள் வாங்கிக்கொண்டிருக்கிறோம். ஆகையால் இந்தப் பிரச்சனை ஒருவாறு தீர்ந்து விடும் என்று கருதுகிறோம்.

SRI K. T. RAJU : சர்க்கார் பஸ்களில் பிரயாணம் செய்கிறவர்களுக்கு சிறிய டிக்கட்டுகள் கொடுக்கப்படுகின்றன. அதை அவர்கள் கூட்டத்தில் எங்கேயாவது விட்டுவிடுகிறார்கள். அப்படிப்பட்ட பிரயாணிகள் டிக்கட்டு இல்லாமல் பிரயாணம் செய்தார்கள் என்று சொல்லி அவர்கள் மீது ஏதாவது நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கப்படுமா?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : டிக்கட்டு இல்லாமல் பிரயாணம் செய்பவர்கள்மீது சட்டபூர்வமாக நடவடிக்கை எடுப்பதற்கு இடம் ஒன்று மில்லை. இருந்தபோதிலும், கண்டக்டர்களிடம் ஜாக்கிரதையாக டிக்கட்டு கொடுக்கும்படியாகச் சொல்லியிருக்கிறோம்.

SRI S. DAIVASIGAMONEY : May I know whether the Members of the Government Transport Advisory Committee are

13th August 1956]

authorized to check ticketless travellers in the buses and if so, may I know whether any hon. Member of this House is a member of the Transport Advisory Committee?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN: Yes, Sir, there are a few Members who are in the Advisory Committee, but they are expected to give general advice.

SRI V. MUTHU : மதுரை நகரத்திலே டி.வி. எஸ் கம்பெனியார் பஸ் ஓட்டுகிறார்கள். அங்கும் பஸ்ஸில் இதேமாதிரி ஏராளமான ஜனங்கள் பிரயாணம் செய்கிறார்கள். டிக்கட்டு இல்லாமல் பிரயாணம் செய்வதை அவர்கள் இரண்டுவிதத்தில் தடுக்கிறார்கள். ஒன்று, அங்கு பஸ்களில் எல் லோரும் உட்கார்ந்துகொண்டு பிரயாணம் செய்வதால் நிற்கும் பிரயாணிகள் குறைவு. இரண்டாவதாக, பிரயாணிகள் இறங்கும்பொழுது உபயோகித்த டிக்கட்டுகளை போடுவதற்கென்று வைத்திருக்கும் பெட்டியில் டிக்கட்டுகளை போடுகிறார்களா என்று டிரைவர் கவனித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறார். ஆகையால் டிக்கட்டு இல்லாமல் பிரயாணம் செய்வதை அவர்கள் இந்த இரண்டு வழி களில் தடுக்கிறார்கள். அம்மாதிரி இங்கும் செய்வதற்கு ஏற்பாடு செய்ய முடியுமா ?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN : இங்கு பஸ் நெருக்கடி இருப்பது எல்லா அங்கத்தினர்களுக்கும் தெரிந்த விஷயம்தான். இப்பொழுது 160 பஸ்கள் வாங்கி அவைகளைக் கட்டுவதற்கு ஏற்பாடு செய்திருக்கிறோம். அதிகமான பஸ்களைப் போட்டிருக்கொஞ்சம் நிற்கின்ற பிரயாணிகளின் உபத்திரவம் இருக்காது என்று நினைக்கிறேன்.

Medium of instruction in Tribal School, Kangudy (Gudalur)

* 75 Q.—SRI K. MADHAVAN NAMBIAR (on behalf of Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar): Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments and Transport be pleased to state—

(a) What is the language in which pupils are taught in the Government Tribal School, Kangudy (Gudalur);

(b) whether there is any proposal to change the medium of instruction in that school; and

(c) if so, why?

THE HON. SRI B. PARAMESWARAN: (a) Malayalam, Sir.

(b) No, Sir.

(c) Does not arise.

Amendment to the Criminal Procedure Code

* 76 Q.—SRI K. MADHAVAN NAMBIAR (on behalf of Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar): Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have any proposal to amend the Criminal Procedure Code in regard to the Judicial Officers who are exercising appellate powers; and

(b) if so, whether the Government have consulted the Central Government in this behalf?

[13th August 1956]

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : The answer to both the clauses is in the affirmative.

In this connection the attention of the hon. Member is invited to his previous Legislative Assembly question No. 3277 which was answered on the floor of the House on 5th March 1956.

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN : Sir, as the need for clothing the Subdivisional Magistrates in the mufassal with appellate powers over the judgments of Second-class Magistrates is keenly felt by the Members of the Bar and the litigant public, is there any proposal to give that power to the Subdivisional Magistrates?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : For that purpose we will have to amend the Criminal Procedure Code. We have formulated a Bill for that purpose and we have sought the permission of the Government of India to proceed with that Bill.

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM : Sir, if I remember right, the Hon. the Minister for Law said the other day that they will bring in a measure for that purpose. When can we expect that measure?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : That is what I have stated. We have sought the permission of the Government of India to proceed with the Bill. As soon as permission is obtained, we will bring it before the House.

*Changes in the rules for the Subordinate Service
in the State*

* 77 Q.—**SRI S. RAMALINGAM** (on behalf of Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state whether the Government have any proposal to effect any change in the Service Rules of the various Subordinate Services, and if so, what are the salient principles on which changes are proposed?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : The answer to the first part of the question is in the negative. The later part does not arise.

SRI K. C. GOPALAN UNNI : Is it a fact that refusal to accept pay is punishable under the Rules?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I would like to have notice.

(Questions Nos. 78 and 79 were taken up together.)

Felling of teak and rosewood trees in Malabar district

* 78 Q.—**SRI K. MADHAVAN NAMBIAR** (on behalf of Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have issued any instructions to the Forest Department in 1955-56 to cut teakwood trees in the Malabar forests, aged 30;

13th August 1956]

(b) the value of the trees so cut during that year; and

(c) the number of trees so cut and removed outside Malabar district?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : (a) No, Sir.

(b) & (c) Does not arise.

* 79 Q.—SRI K. KUNHI MOHAMED SHAFEE : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state the estimated total number of teak and rosewood trees to be cut from the Reserved Forests in Malabar and removed to places in Coimbatore district under the recent orders of the Government and the approximate total value of the same?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : The Government have not issued any orders for the felling of teak and rosewood trees in the Reserved Forests in Malabar district and their removal to Coimbatore district.

SRI K. KUNHI MOHAMED SHAFEE : Sir, question No. 78 is about the orders issued in the year 1955-56. On the other hand, question No. 79, is about the recent circular issued by the Chief Conservator of Forests to the Forest officers of the Coimbatore Division. May I know from the Hon. Minister whether he has enquired into the allegations, which were published in the newspapers of Malabar as also some of the Madras newspapers? The then Minister in charge of Forests is stated to have given a statement to the papers to the effect that he had called for reports from the concerned forest divisions. May I know whether the Hon. Minister has anything to say on these facts?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Sir, may I with your permission, read question No. 79 put by the hon. Member : "Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state the estimated total number of teak and rosewood trees to be cut from the Reserve Forests in Malabar and removed to places in Coimbatore district under the recent orders of the Government and the approximate total value of the same?". I have given the answer that the Government have not issued any orders. I am not fully aware of what all has appeared in the press in Malabar or anywhere else. I have given the information that the Government have not issued any orders and no trees have been cut.

SRI K. P. GOPALAN : Sir, may I know whether the Government have issued any circular to the Departmental officers not to cut trees in Malabar and if so, what is the reason for such a circular?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Sir, in 1954 the Government discussed with the Chief Conservator of Forests about the methods to be adopted in the matter of rotation that has to be observed for thinning teakwood trees, which is a technical

[13th August 1956]

process. The Government considered the suggestion and agreed with the Chief Conservator in 1954 that if there was to be a rotation of thinning once in 28 to 30 years, the revenue will be increased by 15 per cent. In accordance with the decision taken in 1954, the Department proceeded to take action for cutting the trees, which were found to be fit for thinning and they called for tenders. Immediately there was an agitation in the press that the Government were taking wrong steps. There were even petty charges against the Government and in view of these suspicions—although they were absolutely baseless—the Government instructed the officers not to proceed with the cutting.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : Sir, though the Government say that there was no actual cutting, is it a fact that a very large number of trees in Malabar Reserve Forests or Malabar forests were marked for cutting and if the decision to cut the trees beyond thirty years was taken in 1954, may I know why the Government did not issue orders up till now? Were they waiting for the trees to get 30 years old?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Yes, Sir, the Government did not even now issue any orders. The trees were marked with a view to arrange for calling for tenders. I may add that this procedure applied not only to the Malabar areas but also to the non-Malabar areas of the Madras State.

SRI K. C. GOPALAN UNNI : Sir, is it not a fact that about 978 trees about six feet in girth were marked in Thonikkadavu range on the Malabar side after January of this year and that about 90 trees were cut and only then orders were passed to stop the cutting of the trees? I had been to that place and I was told that orders had been received not to cut the trees further after the 90 trees had already been cut.

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Sir, I do not have detailed information with me. Perhaps the hon. Member is correct.

SRI K. KUNHI MOHAMED SHAFEE : Sir, in Thonikkadavu reserve forests and the Tekkadi forest area of the Coimbatore Division, there was a large scale felling of trees. That was the allegation made in the press. Though these areas belong to the Coimbatore Division for administrative purposes, they belong to the Malabar district. When complaints and allegations were made in papers, it was said that an order was issued by the Government to the forest officers for stopping the felling. There was also allegation to the effect that trees below 2 feet girth at the breast-height were also felled and removed to the Coimbatore district side. May I know whether the hon. Minister has any information about the number of trees felled in these areas and the estimated value of the trees so felled?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM: I do not have information about the exact number of trees that were cut and the value of those trees. The trees that are cut are removed to the nearest timber depot for sale. The hon. Member is perhaps aware that the timber depot for the sale of trees cut in the Thonikadavu forest, which is in the Coimbatore Division, is at Pollachi. The hon. Member is perhaps also aware that there are timber depots in the Mysore State also to which the cut trees are removed for the purpose of sale.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : Once the policy is settled by the Government that for the purpose of thinning the forests, trees should be cut at the end of thirty or forty years, whatever the period may be, do the departmental officers proceed to allot trees for cutting on their own initiative or do they obtain the prior sanction or approval of the Government?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : No prior sanction of the Government is necessary. Automatically the departmental officers proceed year by year according to the policies that are settled by the Government.

SRI M. PALANIYANDI : மலையாளிகள் பிரிந்துபோகும் சமயத்தில் இம்மாதிரி விஷமப் பிரசாரங்களை சில தினத்தாள் உள் செய்கின்றன. மலையாளத்திலிருந்து எதிரா சில பொருள்கள் தமிழ்நாட்டுக்குக் கொண்டு போய்விட்டதாகவும், திருப்பவும் திருப்பியனுப்பிவிட்டதாகவும், இன்னும் இம்மாதிரியான செய்திகள் சில தினத்தாள் வருவதைக் கண்டு மலையாள அங்கத்தினர்கள் கேள்விகள் கேட்கிறார்கள். இதனால் தமிழ்நாட்டு மக்களும் மலையாளிகளினப்போல் கொதிப்படைந்து வருகிறார்கள். ஆகவே, விஷமப் பிரசாரம் செய்துவரும் பத்திரிகைகளின்மீது சர்க்கார் நடவடிக்கை எடுக்குமா ?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : இதுபற்றியெல்லாம் கனம் அங்கத்தினரைப் போன்றவர்கள் தான் கவனித்துக்கொள்ள வேண்டும்.

SRI R. KRISHNASWAMI NAIDU : ஜூலை மாதம் 30-ந் தேதியன்று நான் நீலகிரி ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள கூடலூருக்குச் சென்றிருந்தபோது அங்குள்ளவர்கள், கூடலூர் பகுதியிலுள்ள சர்க்கார் காடுகளிலிருந்து பெரு வாரியான ஜாதி மரங்களை மலபார் ஜில்லாவுக்கு இடம்பெயர்வை வாரிகளின் மூலமாக எடுத்துக்கொண்டு போவதாக சொன்னார்கள். ஒன்றிரண்டு மலையாளிகளும் கூட அது வாஸ்தவம் என்று சொன்னார்கள். சர்க்கார் உத்திரவின்படிதான் அப்படிச் செய்யப்படுகிறதா அல்லது வேறு விதமாகச் செய்யப்படுகிறதா என்பதை சர்க்கார் கவனிப்பார்களா?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : போகின்ற இடங்களில் யாரோ பரபரியாக சொல்வதையெல்லாம் பெரிதாக எடுத்துக் கொண்டு, அதுவும் இந்தச் சமயத்தில் கேள்வி போடுவது அவ்வளவு சரியல்ல என்று தாழ்மையுடன் கனம் அங்கத்தினருக்குத் தெரிவித்துக் கொள்கின்றேன்.

SRI K. KUNHI MOHAMED SHAFEE : Considering the apprehensions and suspicions created in the mind of the general public, will the Government conduct an enquiry into the matter and make the position clear by issuing a statement?

[13th August 1956]

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I do not think any enquiry will remove this kind of suspicion. Perhaps the only remedy is separation, which will come about on 1st November and not on 1st October.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : For how many centuries were the Government following the practice of cutting trees after they reached 17 years and what was the particular expert evidence that was available to the Government to change their policy in 1954?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I do not have with me the history of the Forest Department for centuries. I say there was a discussion and on the basis of expert opinion the Government took a decision in 1954. It is of course open to the hon. Member after the Kerala State is formed to get the opinion of his own experts, reverse that policy and pursue his own policy.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : This decision was arrived at in view of the policy which the Travancore-Cochin Government are pursuing. They are adopting a rotation of 17 to 18 years. As a matter of fact, the Chief Conservator of Forests put forward the proposal that we should adopt what was prevailing in the Travancore-Cochin State, that is, the 17 or 18 year rotation. After considering all aspects and after consulting experts, we thought that 17 or 18 year rotation would not be good. That was why 30 year rotation was fixed. On that basis it was calculated that we would have an increase of revenue by 15 per cent. We have taken into account the experience of the Travancore-Cochin particularly in this matter.

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I may also add that according to the opinion of the Chief Conservator of Forests expressed in 1954, 17 to 18 year rotation would even double the income. But we have not accepted that.

SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI : In view of the fact that professedly non-communal parties are putting questions which are likely to increase the existing communal tension, will the hon. Members who are putting questions at least make specific allegations with regard to the constituencies which they represent?

SRI M. CHADAYAN : വരുന്നിപ്പോഴുതുകേയും ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ പ്രസ്തോതിനേയും അടിസ്ഥാനപ്പെടുത്തി എം. പി. സി. സി. പ്രസിഡെന്റ് തുടങ്ങി ഉത്തരവാദിത്വമുള്ള ആളുകൾ സ്ഥലത്തുപോയി അന്വേഷണം നടത്തിയശേഷം ആനകളെ കഷ്ടതിക്കുവാൻ പോകുകയും മരം മുറിച്ചു കടത്തുകയും മറ്റും ചെയ്തിട്ടുള്ളത് വാസ്തവമാണെന്ന് ഒരു പ്രസ്താവന പുറപ്പെടുവിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളത് ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ ശ്രദ്ധയിൽപ്പെട്ടിട്ടുണ്ടോ? ഉണ്ടെങ്കിൽ ഇതിനെ സബ്ജക്ട് തമിഴ്നാട്ടിലേയും മലബാറിലേയും എം. എൽ. എ. മാരടങ്ങിയ ഒരു കമ്മിറ്റിയെ നിയമിച്ചു അന്വേഷണം നടത്താൻ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് മുൻപാലു വരുമോ?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : பொருப்புள்ள தனவான்களெல்லாம் இம்மாதிரி ஆதாரமற்ற புகார்கள் சொல்லுகிறார்கள் என்பதுதான் மிகுந்த ஆச்சரியமளிக்கிறது.

13th August 1956]

Sugar Factory at Koliayanur

* 80 Q.—SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN (on behalf of Sri K. Aranganathan): Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state at what stage the starting of a sugar factory at Koliayanur very near Valavanur and Villupuram stands at present?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM: The East India Distilleries and Sugar Factories, Limited, which has been granted a licence to establish a sugar factory at Koliayanur has not yet taken effective steps to set up the factory.

SRI V. R. NAGARAJAN: When a question was put in this Assembly on a former occasion about this sugar factory, the Hon. Minister was pleased to say that the East India Distilleries had been asked to surrender their licence. May I know whether anybody else had applied for starting a sugar factory there and whether it is a fact that Sri M. A. Chidambaram Chettiar, a leading industrialist in this State, has applied for licence for starting the factory?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM: Yes, Sir. There are applicants who are prepared to undertake the starting of a factory in this area in the private sector. But still the Government do not have definite information as to what the East India Distilleries are proposing to do. Government are looking into the matter in consultation with the Government of India.

Betterment levy

* 80-A Q.—SRI N. K. PALANISAMY: Will the Hon. the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state whether there is any proposal to reduce the betterment levy to be imposed in the Lower Bhavani Project area?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU: I am sorry I was not here in time to answer question No. 63 addressed to me. I am obliged to the Hon. the Finance Minister for answering it and giving more information than what I myself could have given.

The answer to the question now put is: No, Sir.

SRI N. K. PALANISAMY: The water rate and other charges in the Lower Bhavani area come to nearly Rs. 30 per acre. As in no other country such heavy taxes as those in the Lower Bhavani area are levied, will the Government be pleased to consider the dropping of the betterment levy in the Lower Bhavani Project area alone?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU: It was after a great deal of deliberation that the Select Committee recommended the rules and regulations that are now operative. So we have to wait and see how they work.

[13th August 1956]

SRI K. T. RAJU : லோயர் பவானி பிராஜெக்ட் ஏரியாவிலே ஏற்கெனவே அதிகத் தண்ணீர்த் தீர்வை, இன்னும் மற்றும் பலவிதமான 'ஸெஸ்' இருப்பதாலும், அங்கு புஞ்சைப் பயிர் செய்வதற்குத்தான் தண்ணீர் உத்தரவாதம் இருப்பதாலும், நில அபிவிருத்தி வரியை அமுலாக்காமல் இருப்பதற்கு நமது அமைச்சரவர்கள் நடவடிக்கை எடுப்பார்களா ?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : The question relates to betterment levy. As regards water rate and all that, that is a different thing.

MR. SPEAKER : Question hour will be extended by ten minutes to dispose of the remaining questions.

SRI K. R. NALLASIVAM : அது 'மாதிரித் திட்டம்' என்று சர்க்காரே ஒத்துக்கொள்கிறது. பத்து நாட்களுக்கு ஒரு தடவைதான் அங்கு தண்ணீர் விடப்படுகிறது. மற்ற எந்த இடத்திலும் இல்லாத ஒரு விசேஷ நிலைமை அங்கு இருக்கிறது. பூரணம் அடைந்த திட்டமாகவும் கருதப்படவில்லை. இதை வைத்துக்கொண்டு மாகாணத்தின் இதர பகுதிகளில் செய்யவேண்டும். ஆகவே இது ஒரு பரிசோதனை திட்டமாக இருப்பதால் இதற்கு விதி விலக்கு அளிப்பார்களா ? முதல் திட்டமாக இப்பதால், அதற்கு அபிவிருத்தி வரியிலிருந்து விதி விலக்கு கொடுக்க சர்க்கார் முன் வருவார்களா ?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : I do not know wherefrom the hon. Member got the facts for his thesis. The Government have passed an Act, and after the passing of the Act, they have relaxed it to a certain extent. We have referred the matter to the respective authorities and we are further examining it.

10
a.m.

SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI : I rise on a point of order, Sir. According to the convention, if a question is put in Tamil, the answer normally is to be given in Tamil. The question now put by Sri K. R. Nallasivam was in Tamil and we expected an answer from the Hon. Minister in Tamil.

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. Member Sri K. R. Nallasivam understands English.

SRI S. RAMALINGAM : இன்னும் ஒரு வருஷ காலத்துக்கு லோயர் பவானி ஏரியாவில் அபிவிருத்தி வரி விதிப்பதில்லை என்பதுதான் சர்க்காரின் உத்தேசமா ?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : ஏதோ ஒன்று அல்லது இரண்டு வருஷங்களுக்கு விதிப்பதில்லை என்று உத்தேசம். அது எனக்கு ஞாபகமில்லை. அந்தக் காலவரையறை எப்பொழுது முடியும் என்பது எனக்குத் தெரியாது.

Travelling allowance

* 80-B Q.—**SRI K. MADHAVAN NAMBIAR** (on behalf of Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state whether the Government have passed any orders increasing the travelling allowance of—

(a) Tahsildars;

13th August 1956]

(b) Agricultural Demonstrators; and

(c) Sub-Inspectors?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : (a) Yes. The fixed travelling allowance in the case of Tahsildars has been raised from Rs. 49-2-0 to Rs. 75 per mensem.

(b) & (c) No.

Village officers

* 80-C Q.—SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that a large number of village officers in Namakkal subdivision, Salem district, have been placed under suspension since April 1956; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : (a) & (b) Three village headmen and one karnam were suspended after April 1956. One headman was suspended for an offence under the Madras Prohibition Act and another for failure to detect and report a case of illicit tree cutting. The other headman and the karnam were suspended for slackness in their duties.

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : சர்க்கார் கால்நடைக் கணக்கு எடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று உத்தரவு போட்டிருந்த அதே நேரத்தில் நாமக்கல் ஆர்.டி.ஓ. ஜமாபந்தி கூட்டி, ஜமாபந்திக்கு வரவில்லை என்ற காரணத்திற்காக கிராம மணியக்காரர், கணக்குப்பின்னை இவர்களை சஸ்பெண்ட் செய்தது உண்மையா, இல்லையா என்பதை அறிய விரும்புகிறேன்.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : ஜமாபந்திக் கணக்குகளை குறித்த காலத்தில் எழுதவில்லை என்ற காரணத்திற்காகவும், நெ. 5, 6 கணக்கு எழுதவில்லை என்ற காரணத்திற்காகவும் அவர்கள் சஸ்பெண்ட் செய்யப்பட்டார்கள்.

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : அப்படி எத்தனைபேர் சஸ்பெண்ட் செய்யப்பட்டார்கள் என்பதை அறிய விரும்புகிறேன்,

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : ஆத்தூரில் கர்ணம் கொட்டவாடி ஒருவர்தான்.

Commercial Tax Department

* 80-D Q.—SRI K. MADHAVAN NAMBIAR (on behalf of Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have sanctioned the appointment of a special detection staff for the Commercial Tax Department; and

(b) if so, whether any special training is given to them in detection work?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : (a) Yes.

(b) No.

[13th August 1956]

SRI N. K. PALANISAMY: May I know, Sir, whether any special Mobile section has been constituted in Madras apart from the Investigating section in the Commercial Tax Department?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU: The Government have constituted a "Detection Staff" on the lines on which this work is being carried on in the Central Excise Department.

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR: May I know, Sir, from the Hon. Minister whether the Government are contemplating to take any action on the recommendations of the Taxation Enquiry Commission, especially with regard to the prevention of the evasion of tax by constituting an Intelligence section attached to the Commercial Tax Department?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU: The hon. Member started from the Taxation Enquiry Commission's recommendations and then asked about the Intelligence section. A sort of Detective Staff has been appointed.

* 80-E Q.—SRI K. MADHAVAN NAMBIAR (on behalf of Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar): Will the Hon. the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have instructed the Commercial Tax Officers not to stay collection of taxes pending appeals to them from the orders of the Deputy Commercial Tax Officers in matters of sales tax; and

(b) if so, the reasons therefor?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU: (a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

Single-point sales tax

* 80-F Q.—SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP: Will the Hon. the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have decided about the articles that are to be brought under single-point sales tax; and

(b) if so, what they are?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU: (a) Yes.

(b) Coffee, tea, cement, motor cars, refrigerators, kerosene, chemical fertilisers and cane jaggery.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP: Sir, are we to understand that the Government have accepted in principle the single-point sales tax and only take time to introduce the system in respect of all articles?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU: In principle, so far as it goes; that is, in the case of commodities where the principle of single-point sales tax can be applied.

13th August 1956]

SRI K. T. RAJU : இந்த எட்டு பொருள்களைத்தவிர வேறுபொருள்களின்மீது ஒருமுனை விற்பனை வரி கொண்டுவருவதற்குத் தகுதியில்லையா ? அப்படிக் கொண்டுவருவது சர்க்கார் ஆலோசனையில் இருக்கிறதா ? அதன் மூலம் சர்க்காருக்கு என்ன நஷ்டம் ஏற்படும் ?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : நான் முன்பு சொல்லிய எட்டு வஸ்துக்களின்மேரில் ஒருமுனை விற்பனை வரி போட உத்தேசம். அம் மாதிரி வகையில் ஏதாவது பொருள்கள் இருந்தாலும் அவைகளின்மீதும் ஒருமுனை வரி போடலாம்.

SRI N. K. PALANISAMY : In Parliament, in answer to an interpellation of Sri Raghuramayya it was given out that because of multi-point sales tax, food prices had risen. Therefore, will the Government consider the suggestion of the Central Government and at least abolish the tax on foodgrains?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : My impression is that the Taxation Enquiry Commission have favoured the levy of multi-point tax rather than the single-point tax.

SRI M. NARAYANA KURUP : Sir, the question is whether the Government have received the opinion of the Central Government that they are for the single-point sales tax and not for multi-point sales tax and, if so, whether any consideration has been given to that opinion.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : I do not remember, Sir, we have had any such communication.

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM : கனம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் கொடுத்த பதிலிலிருந்து ஒருமுனை வரி விதிப்பதற்கு தகுந்த பொருள்கள் ஒரு பகுதி, பலகட்ட விற்பனைவரி விதிப்பதற்குத் தகுந்த பொருள்கள் ஒரு பகுதி என்று இரண்டு பகுதிகளாக சர்க்கார் பிரித்திருப்பதாகத் தெரிகிறது. அப்படியானால் எந்த அடிப்படையில் இப்படி பிரித்திருக்கிறார்கள் ? சர்க்கார் கொள்கை இனி எப்படி இருக்கும் என்பதை அறிய விரும்புகிறேன்.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : எந்த அடிப்படையில் என்றால், சில வஸ்துக்கள் எங்கே உற்பத்தியாகிறதோ அங்கே வரிபோடலாம், ஏமாற்றமுடியாதது, ஆனால் மற்றும் சில பொருள்கள் பல இடங்களில் உற்பத்தியாகி பல வழிகளின் மூலமாகப் போகின்றன, அவைகளுக்கு ஒருமுனை வரி போட்டால், எங்கேனும் ஒரு இடத்தில் ஏமாற்றி விட்டால் கடைசிவரையில் ஏமாற்றிவிடலாம்.

Potters Co-operative Societies

* 80-G Q.—**SRI S. PAKKIRISWAMY PILLAI :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received any representation, dated 14th May 1956, from the Rajapalayam-Avarampatti Potters' Co-operative Production Sales Society, Limited, Rajapalayam, requesting them to extend the exemption from the payment of sales tax for the year 1955-56 also in respect of all the Potters' Co-operative Societies in the State; and

(b) if so, the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : (a) Yes,

[13th August 1956]

(b) The society was informed that all sales effected by Cottage Industrial Co-operative Societies of pots, etc., produced by members of such societies were permanently exempt from the levy of sales tax with effect from 1st April 1955.

Failure of second crop in Malabar in 1955-56

* 80-H Q.—SRI E. T. KUNHAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) the number of petitions received by the Tahsildar, Ponnani, from agriculturists regarding the failure of second crop in 1955-56 due to excess rainfall;

(b) the total acreage so affected; and

(c) the relief measures adopted by the Government in the matter?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : (a) One hundred and ninety-three.

(b) (i) *Double-crop wet lands*.—Out of 113 acres of double-crop wet lands, crops in 58 acres were partially affected and crops in the remaining 55 acres were completely lost.

(ii) *Single-crop wet lands*.—Out of 491 acres of single-crop wet lands crops in 222 acres were partially affected and crops in 269 acres were completely lost.

(c) A sum of Rs. 835 was granted to 74 cultivators as financial assistance at the rate of Rs. 10 to Rs. 20 each cultivator. In addition, Takkavi Loans amounting to Rs. 9,970 were also sanctioned to 124 deserving persons.

Firka Village Officers' demands

* 80-I Q.—SRI K. KUNHI MOHAMED SHAFEE : Will the Hon. the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have received recently any resolutions passed by the Firka Village Officers' Associations in the Malabar district at the meetings held on the 15th June 1956; and

(b) if so, the requests contained therein and the action taken thereon?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : (a) Yes.

(b) The Associations have requested early orders for the redress of their grievances. The Cabinet Sub-Committee which is going into the service conditions of Village Officers has not submitted its report. The Government will pass orders in the matter as soon as the Committee submits its report.

13th August 1956]

UNSTARRED QUESTIONS.

Sale of handloom cloth in shandies and weekly markets

1 Q.—SRI A. RATNAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) the number of centres opened to sell handloom cloth in shandies, weekly markets, etc., through hawkers;

(b) the number of depots and emporia for the sale of handloom cloth in the City and in the State; and

(c) the nature of Government subsidy granted and the measures taken by the Government under the Pilot scheme to grant financial assistance?

A.—(a) Twelve weavers' co-operative societies, at the rate of one in each of the following twelve circles, in charge of Deputy Registrars of Co-operative Societies, are working the scheme for the sale of handloom cloth through hawkers:—

1 Chingleput.	7 Ramanathapuram.
2 Cuddalore.	8 Vellore (North).
3 Kumbakonam.	9 Salem.
4 Tiruchirappalli (North).	10 Erode.
5 Madurai.	11 Malabar (North).
6 Tirunelveli.	12 Coimbatore.

	Depots.	Emporia.	
(b) Madras City	7	9	} As on 30th April 1956.
Madras State (excluding Madras City).	221	42	

(c) A scheme for the relief of weavers from indebtedness to master-weavers has been formulated so that they may become members of weavers' co-operatives. Under the scheme, loans will be granted to weavers to discharge their debts to master-weavers. The loans will be interest-free and will be repayable within a period of ten years, the first instalment being payable after two years of the drawal of the loan. On becoming members of co-operative societies, each of the weavers will be given a grant to provide himself with a loom. In the first instance, a limited number of weavers in each circle will be admitted to the benefit of the scheme, which will be implemented in the circles of Cuddalore, Salem, Madurai, Vellore (South), Mangalore and Malabar (North). The total cost of the scheme is estimated at Rs. 3,33,080 of which Rs. 2,72,600 will be loans and Rs. 60,480, grants. The scheme will be implemented on the allotment of funds for the purpose during 1956-57 by the Government of India, from the Cess Fund.

[13th August 1956]

Educational institutions in the districts

2 Q.—SRI K. ARANGANATHAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state the number of middle schools, high schools, arts colleges and professional colleges in the districts of the State in the school-year 1955-56?

A.—A statement^a is laid on the table of the House.

Judicial Service Officers

3 Q.—SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state the total number of Civil Judicial Officers and Subdivisional Magistrates and District Magistrates in the State and among them how many are Malaya-alees?

A.—A statement^b is placed on the table of the House.

Civil Courts in Malabar

4 Q.—SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state how many Munsifs' Courts and Sub-Courts existed in Malabar on 31st March 1956 and how many Courts have been sanctioned since and why?

A.—A statement^c showing the District Munsifs' Courts and the Sub-Courts that existed in Malabar on 31st March 1956 and those that were sanctioned since that date together with the reasons therefor is placed on the table of the House.

Revenue received in certain Sub-Registrar's offices

5 Q.—SRI K. MADHAVAN NAMBIAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Religious Endowments and Transport be pleased to state the revenue received from the following Sub-Registrars' offices for the financial year ending 31st March 1956: (1) Fort Cochin, (2) Uliyil and (3) Kumaranallur?

A.—The particulars are furnished below:—

Name of the office.	Revenue received during the financial year ending 31st March 1956.	
	RS.	
1 Fort Cochin	..	.. 5,434
2 Uliyil	..	.. 10,584
3 Kumaranallur	..	.. 6,159

^a Printed as Appendix I on page 593—*infra*.

^b Printed as Appendix II on page 594 *infra*.

^c Printed as Appendix III on pages 594-595 *infra*.

13th August 1956]

Lands in Vriddhachalam taluk

6 Q.—SRI M. KATTIMUTHU : Will the Hon. the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state how many acres of patta lands, how many acres of waste lands and how many acres of forest lands are available in Vriddhachalam taluk of South Arcot district ?

A.—Patta lands—237,659 acres.

Waste lands—

(a) Assessed waste—37,409 acres.

(b) Unassessed waste—1,198 acres.

Forests—17,731 acres.

New schemes introduced in First Five-Year Plan in Vriddhachalam taluk

7 Q.—SRI M. KATTIMUTHU : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state the improvements effected and the new schemes introduced by the Government in the First Five-Year Plan in Vriddhachalam taluk in South Arcot district ?

A.—The First Five-Year Plan was drawn up taking into consideration the needs of the State as a whole. The Government have therefore not drawn up any special schemes for Vriddhachalam taluk or for any other taluk in particular.

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—STATEMENT UNDER RULE 40 OF THE ASSEMBLY RULES *RE* **HARDSHIP FELT BY STUDENTS OF PADAYACHI COMMUNITY.**

MR. SPEAKER : I have received notice under Rule 40 from Sri K. R. Viswanathan calling attention of the Hon. Minister for Finance and Education to a matter of urgent public importance, viz., the hardship felt by the students of the Padayachi community due to the withdrawal of the full-fee concession in schools given to them. Sri Viswanathan may explain his point. 10-10 a.m.

* SRI K. R. VISWANATHAN : Mr. Speaker, Sir, full-fee concession was granted under G.O. No. 1081, Education, dated 2nd August 1954 to the students of the Padayatchi community in the districts of Salem, Tiruchirappalli, Tanjore and South Arcot. This was because this community was included in the list of former criminal tribes circulated along with memorandum No. 34123-D/51/9, Education, dated 28th November 1952. Sir, it is a fact that at one time this community in the four districts was declared as 'a Criminal tribe' and that is why it finds a place in the list referred to by me. In answer to my question on the floor of the House, in July 1953, the then Minister for Law had categorically stated that this community was eligible for full fee concession. I would like to make it clear here that the concession was granted

[Sri K. R. Viswanathan] [13th August 1956]

to this community, not because it is now a criminal tribe, but because it was once declared as a criminal tribe. In Independent India, there is no community which is called a criminal tribe. On or about 20th July 1956, the Government issued a Press Note to the effect that the full-fee concession is restricted to the students of only two villages, viz., Tennore in Tiruchirappalli district and Vellayankuppam in South Arcot district. The issue of this Press Note has struck a catastrophic blow on the life of the students belonging to that community who have been studying in the colleges and schools without any fee and they have now to discontinue their studies. Many of them are asked to pay a lumpsum of fee as arrears for the past two years or so. The hardships felt by these students are unexpected and unbearable. I therefore request the Government not to restrict the full-fee concession only to these two villages, but to extend the same to all the students who could produce the necessary nativity certificate under Government Order No. 1081. Thank you, Sir.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, this question has been discussed on the floor of this House many times. But, there are certain doubts still persisting. Therefore, I would like to give the history of the concessions which were granted to the students belonging to certain communities.

In order to get the reclamation of criminal tribes and habitual offenders, the Government had undertaken several ameliorative schemes in the past which included full-fee concessions to the children of the criminal tribes in schools. This question was considered along with other existing scholarships and stipends by the Retrenchment and Reorganization Committee in 1948 and the Committee recommended that the full-fee concessions should be extended to all boys and girls belonging to the Kallar and other similarly situated communities who were aided through the Police Department as members belonging to the criminal tribes. The same Committee had also recommended that boys and girls of backward communities as listed in the Educational Rules should be given half-fee concession. The recommendations of the Committee were accepted and orders were issued in Government Order Ms. No. 3915, Home, dated 28th September 1949.

As these orders were of a general nature, certain doubts were raised by some managements which were not prepared to implement the terms of the Government Order without getting a list of the so-called eligible tribes for full-fee concession. On a consideration of the matter, Government issued orders in Memo. No. 34123-D/51-9, dated 28th November 1952, giving in an annexure the details of the communities and the districts where they were chiefly found.

Subsequent to the issue of these orders, Sri K. R. Viswanathan, M.L.A., raised the point that children of the eligible communities were not being given the benefit of the concessions on the ground that these pupils described themselves as Vanniyakula

13th August 1956] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

Kshatriyas. The Director of Public Instruction referred the matter to Government and added that the Collector of Tiruchirappalli district observed that 'Vanniyakula Kshatriyas' are considered to be equivalent to Padayachis. The President, District Board, Tiruchirappalli, also made a reference to Government and observed that in parts of the district, Padayachis and Vanniyakula Kshatriyas were one and the same. A reference to the three volumes of Thurston's Castes and Tribes of Southern India showed that Padayachis and Vanniyakula Kshatriyas were synonymous terms describing one and the same community. In view of the fact that the children of these criminal tribes described themselves as belonging to the Vanniyakula Kshatriya community, it was proposed and ordered that the children of the Vanniyakula Kshatriya community in the four districts where they were regarded as equivalent to Padayachis or Criminal Tribes Padayachis should be given the benefit of the full-fee concessions and the orders were accordingly issued.

It will be seen from the above that the intention of Government has been to ensure that the children of the former Criminal Tribes are not denied the benefit of the full-fee concessions intended by Government on the ground that they described themselves as Vanniyakula Kshatriyas. It has, however, been represented to Government that not each and everyone of the Vanniyakula Kshatriya community should be regarded as belonging to the old criminal tribes of Padayachis or Criminal Padayachis and that, therefore, the orders contained in G.O. Ms. No. 1081 are likely to convey the benefit to a larger section of this community. In order to clarify the exact intention and purport of the Government Order, revised orders were issued in G.Os. No. 429, Education, dated 21st March 1955 and No. 430, Education, dated 22nd March 1955, directing that the children of Vanniyakula Kshatriyas of the four districts whose parents were members of the former "Criminal tribes" alone should get the full-fee concessions. It was also ordered that it would be necessary for the children to produce a certificate in the form prescribed in the Madras Educational Rules to the effect that the parent of the boy or girl is a member of the former "Criminal tribes" as specifically stated in the Memo. No. 34123-D/51-9, Education, dated 28th November 1952. It was also made clear that the children of the Vanniyakula Kshatriya community other than those belonging to the former "Criminal tribes" would be eligible only to get the benefit of half-fee concessions admissible to backward communities in all those districts.

In the memorandum, dated 4th September 1955, Sri K. R. Viswanathan, Member of the Legislative Assembly, pointed out the difficulties which pupils belonging to Vanniyakula Kshatriya community at present experienced in getting nativity certificates for the grant of full-fee concessions and requested—

(1) that the authorities who issue nativity certificates for the grant of full-fee concessions to the Vanniyakula Kshatriya pupils

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [13th August 1956]

belonging to the former Criminal tribes, i.e., the Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars, should be supplied with all the relevant Government Orders declaring the above communities as eligible for full-fee concessions;

(2) that the authorities may also be informed where these communities or groups belonging to the former Criminal Tribes live, i.e., the names of villages, taluks and districts where the communities live may be furnished to the authorities;

(3) that the only duty of the village officials should be to certify that the students belong to a certain community living in such and such a village;

(4) that the responsibility of fixing whether the student belongs to a former Criminal tribe or not should be left to the Tahsildar or Deputy Tahsildar who will be guided by the records at his disposal; and

(5) that in the alternative the Members of the Legislature may be authorized to issue such nativity certificates.

The Director of Public Instruction who was consulted submitted the following remarks :—

Requests 1 and 2: The Director of Public Instruction stated that a copy of the orders in Government Memo. No. 34123-D/51-9, Education, dated 28th November 1952 wherein the tribes hitherto known as Criminal Tribes eligible for full-fee concession have been specified might be communicated to the Collectors concerned for necessary action. He also suggested that the information as to the names of the villages where they live might be obtained from the Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Railways and C.I.D., and also in consultation with the District Collectors. An up-to-date list of villages and areas in the districts of Salem and South Arcot where the Vanniyakula Kshatriyas belonging to the former criminal tribes are found was obtained from the Deputy Inspector-General. The Deputy Inspector-General stated that the Tennore Padayachis are the only Vanniyakula Kshatriyas belonging to former criminal tribes in Tiruchirappalli district and that there are no ex-criminal tribes belonging to Vanniyakula Kshatriyas in Tanjore district.

10-20 a.m. The matter was examined in detail with the available Government Orders on the subject. It was considered not possible after a lapse of 22 years to trace the descendants of the various individuals scattered in various villages in the various taluks of the districts of South Arcot and Tiruchirappalli who were declared as members of the criminal tribes. Hence the grant of full-fee concessions under G.O. No. 1081, Education, dated 2nd August 1954 to the descendants of various convicted criminal tribe members was considered impracticable. It was also found that Padayachis living in Tennore in the Tiruchirappalli district and Padayachis living in Vellayankuppam village of South Arcot district alone belonged to the ex-criminal tribes as a class, and that the Padayachis of Tanjore and Salem were never declared as belonging to criminal tribes.

13th August 1956] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

Orders were therefore issued in Government Order No. 1339, Education, dated 12th July 1956 directing that the full-fee concessions be confined to the children of Vanniyakula Kshatriyas or Padayachis belonging to the villages of Vellayankuppam in South Arcot district and Tennore in Tiruchirappalli district. This is the history of the case. I have tried to explain in detail as what all had happened and I have already emphasized that the policy of the Government has been to give the full-fee concession only to children belonging to the members of the ex-criminal tribes and it is restricted only to those cases. We have tried our best to locate where these criminal tribes were residing and are residing and these two villages are mentioned as villages where these criminal tribes are now living. Therefore, under those circumstances, I do not see any hardship caused to any particular community because of this. If it is any hardship, it is a general hardship which applies to every backward community and that question is now under the consideration of the Government with reference to the Report of the Backward Classes Commission. Certainly we cannot single out any particular community within the group of backward classes and give special concessions to them.

III.—DISCUSSION ON THE GOVERNOR'S ADDRESS—cont.

MR. SPEAKER: Now the discussion on the Governor's Address will be continued. The hon. Leader of the Opposition will now speak.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI: கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, கவர்னர் அவர்களின் பிரசங்கத்தின்மீது விவாதத்தை துவக்கிவைத்த நண்பர் மூிகருத்திருமன் அவர்கள் தராதிருஷ்டவசமாக ஆரம்பத்திலேயே கொஞ்சம் காரசாரமாக மற்ற கட்சிக்காரர்களைக் தாக்க ஆரம்பித்தார்கள். அவருக்கு வேறு ஒன்றும் கையில் கிடைக்கவில்லை போலும். கீழ்பவானிப் பிரதேசத்திலுள்ள விவசாயிகளை யாரோ தூண்டிவிடுவதாக ஒரு பெரிய குற்றச்சாட்டு செய்து, தகராறைக் கிளப்பினர். அவர் என் இந்த சண்டைக்கக் கிளம்ப வேண்டுமென்று எனக்குத் தெரியவில்லை. போன தடவை இந்த விவகாரம் சட்ட சபைக்கு முன் வந்தபோழுது, இது விஷயமாக பல சர்ச்சைகளுக்குமேல் சர்ச்சைகள் வந்தபொழுது, சர்க்கார் தரப்பில் அங்கு இருக்கக் கூடிய ஒரு நிலைமை பரிதாபகரமான நிலைமை, அது ரொம்பவும் சிக்கலான ஒரு நிலைமை என்றெல்லாம் ஒப்புக்கொள்ளப்பட்டது. நாங்கள் இது விஷயமாக வெளியிட்ட யோசனையும் ஒப்புக்கொள்ளப்படவில்லை. அது வசியமாக விவசாயிகளின் தலையில் தண்டவரி போடுவது தப்பு. இந்த நிலைமை அங்கு ஏற்படுவதற்குக் காரணமென்ன? அங்கே கால்வாய்கள் வெட்டும்பொழுது சாதாரணமுறையில் கால்வாய்கள் வெட்டக்கூடாது. பக்கத்தில் “லேனிங்” கொடுத்து கால்வாய் வெட்டவேண்டும். இந்த விஷயத்தை சம்பந்தப்பட்ட என்ஜினியர்கள் சரியாகப் பரிசீலனை செய்து யோசனை கூறவில்லை. தண்ணீர் கசிவு ஏற்படாத அளவுக்கு என்ஜினியர்கள் யோசனை கூறியிருக்கவேண்டும். அவர்களின் தவறுக்காக விவசாயிகளின் தலையில் இந்த வரியைச் சுமத்துவது தவறு. பரிசீலனையை நன்றாக பரிசீலனை செய்து பார்த்து ஒரு சரியான முடிவுக்கு வரவேண்டும். கட்சி வித்தியாசமில்லாமல் ஜனங்களின் பிரதிநிதியாக தேர்ந்தெடுக்கப்பட்டுள்ள எம். எல். எக்களைக் கூட்டி, அல்லது ஒரு கமிட்டியை ஏற்படுத்தி, இந்த சிக்கலான பிரச்சனையை பரிசீலனை செய்து ஒரு சரியான முடிவுக்கு வர முன்வரவேண்டுமென்று நாங்கள் யோசனை கூறினோம். இதில் கட்சி நோக்கம் ஒன்றுமில்லை. பரிசீனை தீர்க்கப்படுவேண்டுமென்பதற்காக நியாய

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

[13th August 1956]

மான ஒரு யோசனையைச் சொன்னால் அதை ஏற்கக்கூடாதா? நிலைமை மோசமாக இருக்கும்பொழுது அதைப் பரிசீலனை செய்து சுமுகமாகத் தீர்க்க முன்வரவேண்டும். நான் மீண்டும் சொல்லுகிறேன். இந்தப் பிரச்சினையை சுமுகமாக தீர்க்கவேண்டுமென்று அக்கரை கொண்டு இந்த யோசனையைச் சொல்லுகிறேன். அவையியமாக தகராறுகளைக் கிளப்ப வேண்டாம்; இல்லாத விவகாரத்தை சிருஷ்டிக்கவேண்டாம் என்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

கவர்னர் பிரசங்க ஆரம்பத்திலே மாகாணப் பிரிவினையைப் பற்றி கூறப்பட்டது. மலையாள தமிழ் மக்களிடையே சுமுகமான உறவு மேலும் மேலும் வளரவேண்டும். மலையாளிகள் பிரிந்துபோய் ஒரு தனி மொழி ராஜ்யத்தை அமைத்துக்கொண்டாலும், நாம் எல்லோரும் ஒரே நாட்டில் வாழவேண்டிய மக்கள். நமக்கிடையே ஒத்துழைப்பு இருக்கவேண்டியது அவசியம். இந்த நேரத்திலே நமக்கிடையே மனக்கசப்பைப்போக்க உண்டியாக முயற்சி செய்யவேண்டுமென்பது என் அபிப்பிராயம். அங்கே மரங்கள் வெட்டப்படுகின்றன. இங்கே மெஷனிகள் அதற்குப்படுகின்றன என்றெல்லாம் சொல்லப்படுவதால் மக்களிடையே சந்தேகங்கள் எழுகின்றன. உதாரணமாக மரம் வெட்டப்படுவதை எடுத்துக்கொள்வோம். இதுபற்றி சர்க்கார் நிலைமையைத் தெளிவாக்கி ஒரு அறிக்கை வெளியிட்டார்களா என்றால், இல்லை. 1954-ம் வருஷத்தில் இது விஷயமாக சர்க்கார் கொள்கை என்ன? நிலைமை மோசமாகாமல் இருப்பதற்குவேண்டி சர்க்கார் என்ன நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துக்கொண்டார்கள் என்றெல்லாம் விஷயத்தை நன்றாக விளக்கி ஒரு அறிக்கை வெளியிடவில்லை. மொட்டையாக விட்டார்கள் ஒரு அறிக்கையை. சர்க்காரின் நோக்கத்துக்கு விரோதமாக ஸ்தல அதிகாரிகள் தவறுதலாக நடந்துகொண்டிருந்தால் அதை யெல்லாம் திருத்துவதற்கு முன்வரவேண்டியது நமது சர்க்காரின் கடமை. மலையாளிகளுக்கு இதுவிஷயமாக ஆத்திரம் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது. அந்த ஆத்திரத்தை சமப்படுத்துவதும் அதைத் தடுப்பதும் முக்கியமான கடமை. நான் யோசனை கூறுகிறேன். சர்க்கார் இந்த யோசனையை ஏற்கவேண்டும் என்பது என்னுடைய விருப்பம்.

10-28
a.m.

இந்த சபையில் இருக்கும்படியான பல கட்சிக்காரர்கள், குறிப்பாக மலையாளத்திலிருந்து வந்திருப்பவர்கள் தமிழ்நாட்டிலிருந்து வந்திருப்பவர்கள், எல்லோரையும் கூட்டவைத்து formal committee யாக சொல்லவில்லையா? சர்க்கார்தரப்பிலிருந்து நிதியமைச்சர் உட்கார்ந்து கொண்டு, இருக்கக்கூடிய நிலைமை முழுவதையும் விளக்கி, வேறு ஏதாவது புரார்கள், விராரணை செய்யவேண்டிய விஷயங்கள் அந்தக்கூட்டத்தில் எழுப்பப்பட்டால், அவை குறித்து விசாரணைசெய்து, அதன்மேல் ஏதாவது நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கவேண்டிவந்தால், அதற்கும் உத்தியோகமளித்தா, தற்போது ஏற்பட்டிருக்கும் மனக்கசப்பை உண்டியாக சபாக்குவதற்குவேண்டிய நடவடிக்கைகள் எடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று நான் இன்றைக்கு சென்னை சர்க்காரை கூட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன். இந்த சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் கனம் பக்தவத்சலம் சொன்னதுமாதிரி, இதற்கு ஒரு பிரகாரம் நவம்பரில் பிரிந்து போவதுதான் என்று சொல்லாமல், பிரிந்துபோகக்கூடிய நேரத்தில் ஓற்றுமை மனோபாவம் வளர்க்கப்படவேண்டும், மனக்கசப்பு ஏற்படவிடக்கூடாது என்பதை ரூபகத்தில் வைத்துக்கொண்டு, இந்த பிரச்சினையில் மனக்கசப்பை போக்குவதற்கு வழி தேடவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

இப்போது கவர்னர் பிரசங்கத்தின் மற்ற பகுதிகளுக்கு வருவோம். கவர்னர் பிரசங்கத்தில், பட்ஜெட் கூட்டகாலத்தில் சர்க்காரால் சொல்லப்பட்ட சில திட்டங்கள் நிறைவேறிவரும்படியான விஷயங்கள் சொல்லப்பட்டிருக்கின்றனவென்பதாயி, பட்ஜெட் கூட்டம் முடிந்து, மூன்று மாதத்திற்கு பிறகு கூடுகிற கூட்டத்தில் இந்த மாகாணத்து ஜனங்களை பாதிக்கும்படியான பல சம்பவங்கள் நடைபெற்று இருந்தபோதிலும், அவைபற்றி ஒன்றும் சொல்லப்படவில்லை. இந்த மூன்று மாத காலத்தில் பல நிகழ்ச்சிகள் நடைபெற்றிருக்கின்றன. குறிப்பாக, இந்த மாகாணத்தில் மட்டுமல்ல, இந்தியா பூராவிலும், விலைவாசி ஏறியிருக்கிறது. இது ஒரு முக்கியமான பிரச்சனை. இந்த விலைவாசி ஏற்றத்தை தொடர்பு தொடர்புதாமாக, சர்க்கார் இதைப்பற்றி கவனித்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறது என்றுமட்டும் சொல்லி

[13th August 1956]

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

யிருக்கிறார். கவனிக்கிறது! கவனிக்கிறது என்று கூட கூறாமல் என்ன பண்ணுவது? இதைத்தவிர வேறு எந்தவிதமான யோசனையோ, இது சம்பந்தமான நிலைமையைப்பற்றிய பரிசீலனையோ, அல்லது அதனால் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கக்கூடிய விளைவுகளைப்பற்றியோ, ஒரு வார்த்தைகூட தொடவில்லை. இந்தப் பிரச்சனையில் எவ்வளவு அசிரத்தை மனோபாவம் இருக்கிறது என்பதற்காக இதை இங்கு குறிப்பிடுகிறேன்.

இரண்டாவதாக, இந்த ராஜ்யம், கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்கள் அதிகமாக இருக்கக்கூடிய ராஜ்யம். இந்த கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களிடையே பெரும் பீதியை உண்டுபண்ணி இருக்கிறது. சமீபத்தில் மத்திய சர்க்காரால் நிர்ணயிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிற ஜவளிக் கொள்கை. இந்த கொள்கைக்கு சென்னை சர்க்கார் உடந்தையாக இருந்து வருகிறார்களா, அது சம்பந்தமாக சென்னை சர்க்காருடைய நிலைமையென்ன, மத்திய சர்க்காருக்கு சென்னை சர்க்கார் என்ன யோசனை கூறிற்று என்று விஷயங்களப்பற்றியெல்லாம் எடுத்துக் கூறவில்லை. இது மிகவும் முக்கியமாக இன்று ராஜ்யத்தில் இருக்கக்கூடிய கைத்தறி நெசவாளர்களின் எதிர்கால வாழ்க்கையைப்பற்றிய பிரச்சனை. இதைப்பற்றி ஒரு வார்த்தைகூட கிடையாது கவர்னர் பிரசங்கத்தில். அவர் பிரசங்கத்தில்தான் சொல்லவில்லையென்றாலும், சர்க்கார் தரப்பில், சட்ட சபை இப்போது கூடும் கூடுகிற காலத்தில் இந்த பிரச்சனையை விவாதிக்க வேண்டும். இது விஷயமாக என்ன நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கவேண்டுமென்பது சம்பந்தமாக சபையில் இருக்கும்படியான அங்கத்தினர்களின் யோசனை கேட்டு தெரிந்துகொள்ளவேண்டுமென்ற அவா சர்க்காருக்கு இருக்கிறது என்பதை எடுத்துக்காட்டுவதற்காகவாது, இந்த சட்டசபை அலுவல் கமிட்டி எடுத்துச் சொல்லாமலே, அவர்களாகவே உத்தியோகமுறையிலேயே இந்த விஷயங்களைப்பற்றி விவாதிக்க சில மணி நேரத்தை ஒதுக்கினார்களா என்றால் அதுவும் கிடையாது. ஏதோ பேச்சுப்போக்கில் கவர்னர் பிரசங்கத்தில் பேசிக்கொண்டீடும் என்ற நிலைமை இருக்கிற தென்றால், இந்த முக்கியமான பிரச்சனையில் சபையை கலந்து ஆலோசிக்க வேண்டுமென்ற நிலைமையிலலை என்றால், சபை எவ்வளவு மதிக்கப்படுகிறது என்பதுதான் கேள்வி.

முதலில் விலைவாசி பிரச்சனையை எடுத்துக்கொள்வோம். நமது நாட்டில் இன்று இரண்டாவது ஐந்தாண்டு திட்டம் அமுலில் இருப்பதாகச் சொல்லப்படுகிறது. இரண்டாவது ஐந்தாண்டு திட்டம் இறுதியாக புத்தக் ரூபத்தில் வெளி வந்தவிட்டது. அதனுடைய லட்சியம் குறிப்பாக என்னவென்று சொல்லப்படுகிறதென்றால் "Reduction of inequalities in income and wealth and a more even distribution of economic power" நாலு லட்சியங்களில் குறிப்பாக ஒரு லட்சியம் நாட்டில் இருக்கும்படியான வருமானத்திலும், செல்வத்திலுமுள்ள ஏற்றத்தாழ்வை குறைப்பது; குறைத்து பணத்தால் ஏற்படக்கூடிய அதிகாரம் சிலர் கையில் இன்றைக்கு சிக்கியிருப்பதை தவிர்த்து, பொருளாதார அதிகாரத்தை மேலும் மேலும் ஜனங்களிடையே சமமாக பங்கிடுவதற்கு முயற்சி செய்வது என்று கூறப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இன்று இந்த ராஜ்யத்தில் மட்டுமல்ல, நமது நாட்டில் நடைபெறும் படியான காரியங்கள், இந்த லட்சியம் நிறைவேறுவதற்கான பாதையில் போய்க்கொண்டிருக்கின்றனவா, விலைவாசி ஏற்றமென்பது இந்த லட்சியம் நிறைவேறும்படியான பாதையில் போகிறதா, அல்லது இதற்கு நேர்மாறான விளைவுகளில் நாட்டை கொண்டு விடப்போகிறதா என்பதை நாம் கவனிக்கவேண்டும். இரண்டாவது ஐந்தாண்டு திட்டத்தில் நாம் ஏற்றுக்கொண்டிருக்கிற லட்சியத்திற்கு மாறாக இருக்கக்கூடிய நிலைமைக்கு இது கொண்டுசெல்லுமோமாதல், அந்த லட்சியம் நிறைவேற்றப்படாது என்றால், பின்பு அதற்கு இந்த இரண்டாவது ஐந்தாண்டு திட்டம் என்ற நிலைமை ஏற்படும். ஆகவே நாம் இதை யோசித்துப் பார்ப்போம். இரண்டாவது ஐந்தாண்டு நகல் திட்டம் இந்த சபையில் விவாதிக்கப்பட்டகாலத்தில், நான் அன்றைக்கு ஒரு விஷயத்தை எடுத்துக் காண்பித்தேன். "இரண்டாவது ஐந்தாண்டு திட்ட காலத்தில் கிட்டத்தட்ட 1,200 கோடி ரூபாய் deficit financing-க்கு ஏற்பாடு செய்யப் போகிறார்கள். இந்த நாட்டில் deficit financing செய்யவேண்டாது என்று நான் சொல்லவில்லையா, இதில் பஸ் ஆபத்துக்கள்

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

[13th August 1956]

நிறைந்திருக்கின்றன. குறிப்பாக பண வீக்கம் ஏற்படும்படியான ஆபத்து மிகவும் அதிகமாக நிறைந்திருக்கிறது. இந்த மாதிரி பண வீக்கம் ஏற்படுவதற்கு முக்கிய காரணம், இந்த deficit financing விளைவாக ஏற்படக்கூடிய bank and credit facilities இந்த நாட்டில் பணத்தை கொண்டு சூதாட்டம் ஆடுகிறவர்கள், அந்த bank and credit facilitiesஐ உபயோகப்படுத்திக்கொண்டு, சாமான்களை வாங்கி சேமித்துவைக்க, தாராளமாக வகை செய்யும். ஆகவே இந்த வசதிகளை தடை செய்ய சர்க்கார் உடனடியாக நடவடிக்கை எடுக்காமற்போனால், பண வீக்கத்தால் மிகப் பெரிய ஆபத்து ஏற்படும்” என்று அன்றைக்கே குறிப்பிட்டேன். நமது நிதியமைச்சர் அன்று இது சரியான யோசனைதான் என்று இந்த இடத்தில் தான் சொன்னார். இந்த இரண்டாவது ஐந்தாண்டு திட்டத்தில் விலைவாசி சம்பந்தமாக, deficit financing சம்பந்தமாக என்னபோடப்பட்டிருக்கிறது.

If we assume that the ratio between currency in circulation and deposit money remains unaltered money supply would show something like a 66 per cent increase over the plan period. National income over this period is expected to increase by 25 per cent and we may assume that an increase of the same order in money supply would in any case be safe. Some allowance must also be made for the increased monetisation of the economy and for the increased demand for cash as levels of living improve and the convenience of holding cash comes within the reach of a large proportion of the people. Even so, the expansion of money supply of the order mentioned cannot but be regarded as the outside limit.

இந்த காலகட்டத்தில் இப்போது நாணயச் செலாவணி எவ்வளவு பழக்கத்தில் இருக்கிறதோ, அதைப்போல மூன்றில் இரண்டு பங்கு அதிக மானிவிலைவாசியிருக்கும். நாட்டில் உள்ள வருமான உயர்வு 25 சதவிகிதம்தான் அதிகமாகியிருக்கும். ஆகவே பெரிய ஆபத்தை விளைவிக்கும். அந்த அளவிற்கு “deficit financing is outside the limit”, வரம்புக்கு அதிகமாக தாண்டியிருக்கிறது என்று தான் கூறவேண்டும் என்ற அவர்களே ஒப்புக்கொண்டு இருக்கிறார்கள். அதன் பிறகு இன்னும் சொல்லுகிறார்கள்.

Deficit financing will augment the ability of banks to extend credit to the private sector. Such expansion will be needed and will be beneficial up to a point. Care will, however, have to be taken to prevent excessive credit expansion which may react adversely on prices and to ensure that credit does not flow into speculation to the detriment of productive activity.

இந்த மாதிரி deficit financing செய்தால் பாங்குகளுக்கு கிடைக்கக் கூடிய பொருள் வசதிகளை speculator கள் உபயோகப்படுத்திக் கொண்டு விலை வாசிகளை தூக்கி விடாமல் பாதுகாக்கவேண்டிய நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துக்கொண்டாக வேண்டுமென்று planning commission திட்டவட்டமாக கூறி யிருக்கிறது. ஆனால் நடந்தது என்ன என்பதுதான் இன்றைக்கு இருக்கும் படியான கேள்வி. விலைவாசி ஏறிக்கொண்டே போகிறது. சர்க்கார் கூறுகிறார்கள் நாங்கள் நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துக்கொண்டு வருகிறோமென்று என்ன நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள்? நியாய விலைக் கடைகள் நிறந்திருக்கிறோம். சென்னையில் கோவாப்பேரடிப் ஸ்டோர்கள் மூலமாக ஐந்து மூட்டை தினம் விற்க ஏற்பாடு செய்திருக்கிறோம், கும்ப கோணத்தில் தினம் 15 மூட்டை விற்க ஏற்பாடு செய்திருக்கிறோம், மலை யாளத்தில் தினம் 10 மூட்டை விற்க ஏற்பாடு செய்திருக்கிறோம் என்று கூறுகிறார்கள். இதுதான் அவர்கள் எடுத்த நடவடிக்கை. இந்த நடவடிக்கை எடுக்க எடுக்க விலை வாசி ஏற்றம் நின்றபாடிஸ்ஸாமல், மேலே

13th August 1956]

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

ஏறிக்கொண்டே போகிறது. ஆகவே இந்த விலையேற்றம் ஏற்படக்கூடிய காலத்தில் இப்போது கேள்வி வந்து விட்டது. “பணவீக்கம் ஏற்பட்டு விட்டதா? விலைவாசி ஏற்றம் எதைக் குறிப்பிடுகிறது” என்பது பற்றி பிரமாமான சர்ச்சை பார்வமெண்டில் எழுந்திருக்கிறது. பண வீக்கம் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது என்று எவ்வாறு மதிப்பிடுவது என்று பேசுகிறார்கள். புள்ளி விவரங்கள் எதைக் காட்டுகின்றன? சர்க்கார் கொடுத்திருக்கும் புள்ளி விவரங்களைக் காட்டுகிறேன். அந்தப் புள்ளி விவரத்தை எடுத்துக் கொள்வோமானால், Index of the wholesale prices of food articles, அதாவது உணவுத் தானியங்களுடைய மொத்த விலையின் புள்ளி விவரம், 1939-ல் 100 என்று வைத்துக்கொண்டால், சர்க்காருடைய புள்ளி விவரத்தை எடுத்துக்கொண்டு பார்ப்போமானால், 1955-ம் வருஷத்தில் பிப்ரவரியில் 304, மார்ச்சில் 297, ஜூனில் 281, ஜூலையில் 309, ஆகஸ்டில் 317, செப்டம்பரில் 315, நவம்பரில் 326, டிசம்பரில் 327 என்று இருக்கிறது. 1956-ல் ஜனவரியில் 353, பிப்ரவரியில் 357, மார்ச்சில் 358, ஏப்ரலில் 360, ஜூனில் 370, ஜூலையில் 378.7. கொரியா யுத்தம் நடந்த காலத்தில் மட்டும்தான், இந்த மாதிரி ஒரே வருஷத்தில்தான் விலை ஏறியிருக்கிறது. 1950-51-ல் கொரியா யுத்தம் நடந்துகொண்டிருந்த காலத்தில் 398, அதற்கு அடுத்த வருஷம் 357 ஆகக் குறைந்து விட்டது. ஆனால் இன்று, கொரியா யுத்தம் நடந்துகொண்டிருந்த காலத்தில் விலை வாகிர்கள் எந்த அளவு ஏறினோ, அந்த அளவுக்கு, வரிசையாக ஏறிக் கொண்டிருக்கின்றன, சர்க்காருடைய புள்ளி விவரம். இந்த ஆண்டில் எட்டு மாத காலத்துக்குள்ளாக, இந்த விலைவாசிகள் ஏறிவந்திருக்கிறது என்பதைப் புள்ளி விவரத்துடன் காட்டுகிறது. இந்தப் புள்ளி விவரங்கள் எதைக் காட்டுகின்றன? ஒரு கால கட்டத்தில் வழக்கமாக ஏறக்கூடிய அளவாய் இல்லை. மிகவும் அதிகமாக, 1955 மே மாதத்திலிருந்து, இந்த 1956 ஜூனுக்குள்ளாக 35 சத விதம் வரையில் விலைவாசிகள் ஏறிவிட்டது. எந்தக் காலத்திலும் இந்த அளவு ஏறவில்லை. கொரியா யுத்த காலத்தில் தான் ஏறியிருக்கிறது. இந்த அபத்தைப் பார்க்காமல் இருக்க முடியுமா? ஏன் இப்போது திடீரென்று விலைவாசி ஏற்றம் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது? இதைக்கூட பரிசீலனை செய்யாத அளவுக்கு, “நாங்கள் கவனித்துக்கொண்டுதான் வருகிறோம்” என்று மீண்டும் மீண்டும் பிரச்சாரம் நடந்துகொண்டிருக்கிறது. சர்க்கார் இன்று இந்த எரிமலையின்மீது விழுந்து கொண்டிருக்கிறது. இந்த விலைவாசி ஏற்றம் இதே ரீதியில் தொடர்ந்து கொண்டே போகமானால், இந்தத் திட்டம் தோற்றுப்போய் விடும். “விலைவாசி ஏற்றத்தை கவனித்தோம், ஏறிக்கொண்டேபோகும் நிலையில் கூட, இந்தத் திட்டம் நிறைவேற்றுவது அவசியமானது” என்ற வாதம் இருக்கிறது. ஆனால் அந்தத் திட்டம் போட்டு ஆறு மாதத்துக்குள் விலைவாசி இந்த அளவுக்கு ஏறிக்கொண்டு வருகிறது. இது சர்க்காருடைய மொத்தப் புள்ளி விவரக் கணக்கு, நமது மாகாணத்தில் பார்ப்போமானால், விலைவாசி எப்படி ஏறிக்கொண்டு வருகிறது? அரிசி, ஒரு வருஷத்துக்கு முன்பு படி 9 அணுவாக விற்பது, 10 அணு, 15 அணு என்று ஏறிக் கொண்டு, ஒரு ரூபாய்க்கு வந்தது, குறைந்த விலைக்கு விற்பது அரிசி. (Blackgram dhall) உளுந்து 8½ அணுவாக இருந்தது, இன்றைக்கு 11-க்கு வந்து, 14 அணுவுக்கு வந்தது, Dhall 10 அணுவாக இருந்தது, 14 அணுவுக்கு அளவுக்கு ஏறிவிட்டது. நல்லெண்ணெய் 3 ரூபாய்க்கு வந்ததாச்சு, 1½ ரூபாயிலிருந்து, மிகளாய் (Chillies) ரூ. 1-12-0 ஆக இருந்தது இன்று ரூபாய் 3-4-0-க்கு வந்து விட்டது. விலைவாசி ஏற்றத்தை எடுத்துக்கொண்டால், இது சாதாரண விலைவாசி ஏற்றமல்ல. இது ஆறு மாதத்திற்குள்ளாக, 100-க்கு 75 சத விதம் என்று சர்க்காருடைய புள்ளி விவரம் காட்டுகிறது. கொஞ்சம் தான் ஏறியிருக்கிறது என்று சொல்வார்கள். ஆனால் உண்மையில், ஜனங்கள் வாங்குகின்ற பொருளைப் பார்ப்போமானால், விலைவாசி ஏற்றமானது, கிட்டத்தட்ட 100-க்கு 75 சத விதம், இந்த எட்டு மாதம், ஒரு வருஷத்துக்குள் ஏறி விட்டது. போன தடவை நான் இதே சட்ட சபையில், பேசுகின்றபோது, இன்றைக்கு விவசாயிகளுக்கு நியாய விலை கிடைக்கவேண்டும் என்று வற்புறுத்தினேன். தஞ்சாவூரில் போன வருஷத்தில் நெல், கலம் ரூ. 10 ஆகக் குறைந்த காலத்தில், “அது மிகக் குறைவாக இருக்கிறது” என்று கூக்குரல்

10.35
a.m.

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

[13th August 1956]

எழுப்பினோம். அதே சமயத்தில் ஸ்ரீமான் பக்தவத்சலம் அவர்கள் கூறினார் “13 ரூபாய்க்கு விறகுல், நியாயமான விலை” என்று சொன்னார். நாங்களும் ஒத்துக்கொள்கிறோம், 13 ரூபாய்க்கும், 15 ரூபாய்க்கும் விறகுல் நியாயமான விலை என்று. அன்றைக்கு தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவில், குற்றலத்தில், நெல் மூட்டை ரூபாய் 19-ல் இருந்து ரூபாய் 20 வரை நெல் விற்கப் பட்டது. ஆகவே இது சாதாரண விலையேற்றமல்ல, அசாதாரண விலை வேற்றம் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கிறது. ஜனவரி மாதத்தில், பிப்ரவரி மாதத்தில், விவசாயிகளுக்குச் கொடுத்த விலை அது அல்ல. சாதாரண விலையில், பண்டங்கள் விற்பனை வந்த காலத்தில் அவர்களுக்கு, ரூபாய் 12 லிருந்து ரூபாய் 14 வரை கொடுத்தாச்சு, அவர்கள் இன்று விற்கிற விலை 19, 20 ரூபாய். இதனால், சாதாரண விவசாயிகளுக்கு நன்மைகளுக்கு ஏற்பட்டதாகச் சொல்ல முடியாது. ஆனால் ஒரு சில தனி நபர்களுக்கு நன்மை ஏற்படுத்தான் இருக்கிறது என்று சொல்கிறேன். அவர்களுக்கு விரோதமாக, சர்க்கார் என்ன நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கப்போகிறது என்பதுதான் question. ஏன் ஐயா இப்படி ஏற்பட்டது? இப்படி இருக்கக்கூடிய கால கட்டத்தில், சர்க்காருடைய deficit financing ஏற்பட்டதின் காரணமாக, போன வருஷம் 290 கோடி ரூபாய் ஆக இருந்தது, இந்த வருஷத்தில் 390 கோடி யாகிவிட்டது. Deficit financing ஏற்பட்டதால், சர்க்காருடைய நோட்டுச் செலாவாணிப் புழக்கம் அதிகப்படி விஸ்தரிக்கப்பட்டது. இதே கால கட்டத்துக்குள்ளாக, கிட்டத்தட்ட 15 சத விதிகம் உயர்த்தப் பட்டிருக்கிறது. இதன் காரணமாக, Reserve Bank கொடுக்கக் கூடிய கணக்குகளை எடுத்துப் பார்ப்போமானால் 1953-ம் வருஷத்தில், மார்ச் மாதம் 1,764 கோடி என்று இருந்தது, 1955-ம் வருஷத்தில் 1,920 கோடி நோட்டு அச்சடிக்கப்பட்டும், மே மாதம், இன்றைக்கு 2,240 கோடி வரை, இன்று புழக்கத்தில் இருக்கிறது. ஆகவே 300 கோடி வரையில் நோட்டு அச்சடித்து விடப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. இந்த அளவு deficit financing ஏற்பட்டு நோட்டுகளை செலாவாணி அதிகமாக விநியோகப்படுத்தினர் களானால், இங்கு ஆபத்து ஏற்படும் என்று யோசித்தார்களா? யோசித்து அதற்குத் தகுந்த நடவடிக்கை உடனடியாக எடுத்தார்களா? குறிப்பிட்டு இதைச் சொல்லவேண்டுமானால், பதுக்கல்காரர்களுக்கு இதனால் சௌகரியம் செய்திருக்கலாம். இந்த மாதிரியான பதுக்கலை உடனே தடைசெய்ய வேண்டி, ஏதாவது ஒரு நடவடிக்கை எடுத்தார்களா? சென்னை அரசாங்கம் அம்மாதிரி நடவடிக்கை எடுக்க வேண்டுமென்று மத்திய சர்க்காரைத் துண்டிணைக்கலா? என்ன நடந்தது. போன வருஷம் 9 கோடி ரூபாய் மார்ச் மாதத்தில், அவர்களுக்குக் கடன் கொடுக்கப்பட்டது பாங்குகள் மூலமாக. இந்த வருஷத்தில் 19 கோடியே 40 லட்சம் ரூபாய் பாங்குகளால் அவர்களுக்குக் கடன் கொடுக்கப்பட்டது. இந்த அளவுக்கு, மத்திய சர்க்காரின் மூலம். இன்றைக்கு, அவர்களுக்கு அதிகம் கடன் கொடுக்கப்பட்டது. ஆகவே, பதுக்கல்காரர்களுக்கு மேலும் மேலும் பதக்குவதற்கு, அந்தக் கடன் உதவினது, பாங்குகள் அவர்களுக்குக் கடன் கொடுக்கிறது. பதினைந்து ரூபாய்க்கு நெல் மூட்டை வாங்க வேண்டுமென்று சொன்னால் 25 சத விதிகம் அதாவது, 3, 3½ ரூபாய் அவர்கள் கையில் முதல் இருந்ததால், அந்த நெல்லை வாங்கி கையிருப்பு செய்யமுடியும். பாக்கி பூரா தொகையைப் பாங்கியிலிருந்து கிடைக்கும். அப்படி நெல் மூட்டைகளை வாங்கிப் பதுக்கி வைக்கிறார்கள். இந்தக் கால கட்டத்தில், இந்தப் பதுக்கல் காரர்கள் பண வீக்கத்தைக் கொண்டு வருகிறார்கள். பண வீக்கம் இருக்கிற காலத்தில் (deficit financing), பதுக்கலைத் தடுக்க வேண்டும் என்று சர்க்கார் ஒப்புக்கொள்கிறார்கள். அதே காலத்தில், அவர்களுக்கு, இந்தச் சமயத்தில், கடன் வசதிகள் அதிகமாகக் கொடுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. ஆகவே, விளைவு என்ன இன்றைக்கு? நெல் பதுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. குற்றலத்தில் இருக்கக்கூடிய மில்காரர்களின் கையில், 12,000 மூட்டை நெல் இன்றைக்கு இருக்கிறதைப் பார்க்கிறோம். இன்றைக்கு அந்த 12 ஆயிரம் மூட்டை நெல், மூட்டை ஒன்று ரூபாய் 13-க்கு வாங்கினால், அதாவது 1 மூட்டை அரிசி 26, ரூபாயாகும், அந்த அரிசியின் விலை கிட்டத்தட்ட 4 கோடி ரூபாய் ஆகும். ஆகவே 26, 27 ரூபாய்க்கு வாங்கினால், இன்றைக்கு 4 கோடி ரூபாய்க்கு விற்பதற்கு, வசதி இருக்கிறது. அதை 13 ரூபாய்க்கு வாங்கி, இப்படி விறகுல், ஒரு லட்சத்துக்கு மேல் லாபம்

13th August 1956] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

கிடைக்கும். இந்த லாபம் சம்பாதித்துத் தருவதற்கு, அவர்களுக்குப் பாங்கிகள் கைவசத்திலிருந்து கடன் கொடுக்கின்றன. ஆனால் அவர்களுக்கு வசதியில்லையா, பாங்கிகள் கடன் கொடுத்துத்தான், இவர்கள் வாங்க வேண்டுமா? இந்த வகையில் **credit facilities** கொடுத்துவிட்டு, அவர்கள் லாபம் சம்பாதித்த பின்னால், **Civil Supplies Commissioner** அவர்களை அனுப்பி வைக்கிறது சர்க்கார். அவர், அவர்களிடத்தில் போய்க் காலைப்பிடித்து கொஞ்சி “ஒரு 5 சத விதிக் குறைத்துக் கொண்டு, எப்படியாவது மார்க்கெட்டில் கொடுப்பதற்கு வாருங்கள்” என்று பேசுகிறார். அங்கே ஒருவர் பேசுகிறார், பத்திரிகையில் வந்தது. மிராசுதார் வக்கீல் ஒருவர் “நிலச் சீர்திருத்தம் கொண்டு வருவதால் தான் விலைவாசி எறிப்போச்ச” என்று பேசுகிறார். வாயில் வந்ததைப் பேச ஆரம்பிக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களிடம் பல்லைக் காட்டுவதைத் தவிர வேறு எந்த விஷயமும் சர்க்காருக்குத் தோன்றவில்லை என்று நான் தைரியமாகச் சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன். முதலாளிகள் பத்து சத விதிக் கொடுப்பார்களானால் நிலை சீர்திருத்தினாலும் என்று ஸ்ரீமான் பத்த வத்சலம் அவர்கள் கேட்டிருக்கிறார். முழுவதையுமே எடுத்துக் கொள்வதற்கே சர்க்காருக்கு அதிகாரம் சிபையாதா என்று நான் கேட்கின்றேன். அப்படிப்பட்ட அதிகாரம் இல்லை யென்றால், சபையைக் கேட்டால் சபை கொடுக்கமாட்டோன் என்கிறதா? கட்டாயம் கொடுக்கும். ஆனால், கண்ட் ரோல் முறையை நாங்கள் கொண்டுவர வேண்டுமென்று சொல்லவில்லை. இந்த நிலைமையைச் சீர்திருத்துவதற்கான முறையில் நாட்டில் ஜனங்களுடைய வாழ்க்கைத் தரத்தைப் பாதிக்கக்கூடிய இந்தப் பிரச்சனை இருக்கும் காலத்தில் உடனடியாக என் நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கக்கூடாது என்று நான் கேட்கின்றேன்.

10-48
a.m.

ஒவ்வொரு பாங்கியிலிருந்தும் யார் யாருக்கு எவ்வளவு கடன் கொடுக்கப் பட்டிருக்கிறதென்று தெரிந்து கொள்ளலாம். யார் யாருடத்தில் எவ்வளவு நெல் “ஸ்பாக்” இருக்கிறதென்பதும் பணம் கடன் கொடுத்த பாங்கிகளிலிருந்து தெரியும். பாங்கிகளில் இருக்கும் ஸ்பாக் பூராவையுமே சர்க்கார் நியாயமான விலை கொடுத்து, அதாவது கலம் ஒன்றுக்கு 13 முதல் 14 ரூபாய் வரையில் கொடுத்து வியாபாரிகளின் கைவசமுள்ள நெல் பூராவையும் சர்க்கார் எடுத்துக் கொள்ளலாம். இதனால் அவர்களுக்கு ஒரு சிறிய நஷ்டம் ஏற்பட்டாலும் பரவாயில்லை. இப்படி நஷ்டம் ஏற்பட்டால் அதிலிருந்து அவர்கள் பாடம் கற்றுக்கொள்வார்கள். மறு படியும் இனிமேல் அவர்கள் இந்த மாதிரி “ஸ்பெகுலேஷன்” செய்து விலையை அதிகமாக்குவதில் இறங்கமாட்டார்கள். ஸ்பெகுலேஷனில் இறங்கினால் அவர்களுடைய ஸ்பாக்குகள் சர்க்காரால் எடுத்துக் கொள்ளப் பட்டுவிடும் என்ற பயம் அவர்களுக்கு இருக்கும். நடவடிக்கை எடுத்தால் ஸ்பெகுலேஷன் குறையும். ஆனால், ஸ்பெகுலேட்டர்களுக்கெதிராக நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கத் தயங்கி, மேலும் மேலும் அவர்களிடம் சென்று, “கொஞ்சம் கொடுங்கள், கொஞ்சம் கொடுங்கள்” என்று கொஞ்சிக் கேட்கும் முறையை இந்தச் சர்க்கார் செய்யாநம் வரையில், நிலைமை எப்படிச் சீர்திருத்தப் போகிறது? எந்தக் காலத்தில் சீர்திருத்தப் போகிறது?

எதற்காக இதைக் குறிப்பிடுகிறேன் என்றால், 12 ஆயிரம் மூட்டைகளை வியாபாரிகள் வைத்துக்கொண்டு அதிக விலைவைத்து விற்பதன் காரணமாக சுமார் ஒன்றரை லட்ச ரூபாய் வரையில் அவர்கள் கையில் போய்ச் சேருகிறது என்பதற்காகத்தான். இப்படியே லாபம் அவர்களுக்குப் போய்க் கொண்டிருந்தால் ஏழை மக்களின் நிலைமை என்ன ஆகும்? சென்னை நகரத்தை உதாரணமாக எடுத்துக்கொள்ளுங்கள். சென்னையில் இன்றைக்கு 15 லட்சம் மக்கள் வாழ்கிறார்கள். அவர்களில் சுமார் மூன்று லட்சம் பேர்கள் கொஞ்சம் நன்றாக வாழ்கிறார்கள் என்று வைத்துக் கொள்ளலாம். பாக்கி 12 லட்சம் ஜனங்கள் தினசரி கால் படி அரிசிதான் சாப்பிடுகிறார்கள் என்று வைத்துக் கொண்டாலும் 12 லட்சம் பேர்களுக்கு மூன்று லட்சம் படி அரிசி தேவைப்படும். நியாய விலைக்கு அதிகமாக ஒரு நாளைக்கு நாண்களு வீதம் சாதாரண மக்கள் கொடுக்க வெண்டியிருக்கிறதென்றால், 50 ஆயிரம் ரூபாய் வரையில் சாதாரண ஜனங்களின் கையிலிருந்து பதுக்கல்காரர்களின் கைக்குப் போகிறது. ஒரு வருஷத்திற்குக் கணக்குப் போட்டுப் பார்த்தால் இரண்டு கோடி ரூபாய் வரையில் சென்னை

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

[13th August 1956]

மக்களிடமிருந்து சில குறிப்பிட்ட பதுக்கல்காரர்களின் கையில் போய்ச் சேருகிறது. நாட்டின் பொருளாதாரத்தை, நாட்டின் வருமானத்தை எல்லோருக்கும் சரி சமமாகப் பங்கிட வேண்டும், அப்படிச் செய்வதுதான் சர்க்காரின் லட்சியம், நோக்கம் என்றெல்லாம் சொல்லப்படுகிறது. ஆனால், அவர்கள் சொல்லிவருகிற லட்சியங்களுக்கும், நோக்கத்திற்கும் நேர்விரோதமாக சாதாரண மக்களுடைய பொருளாதார வசதி குறிப்பிட்ட சில பதுக்கல்காரர்களின் கையில் போய்ச் சேரும்படியான முறையில் காரியங்கள் செய்யப்படுகின்றன. இந்த நிலைமையே போய்க் கொண்டிருந்தால் என்றைக்குத்தான் சர்க்கார் சொல்லி வருகிற லட்சியமும் நோக்கமும் நிறைவேறப் போகிறது என்பதைக் கவனிக்கவேண்டும். லட்சியத்தை மட்டும் சொல்லிக்கொண்டே யிருந்தால் பிரயோஜன மில்லை. லட்சியத்தை காரியத்தில் நிறைவேற்றுவதற்கு உடனடியாக சர்க்கார் நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துக் கொள்ள வேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக் கொள்கின்றேன். தீவிரமான நடவடிக்கை எடுக்காமல், 5 சத விதிகம் கொடுங்கள், 10 சத விதிகம் கொடுங்கள் என்று முத்தலாங்கிகளைக் கேட்பதினாலோ 15 மூட்டை, 10 மூட்டை அரிசியை நிவாரணக் கடைகளில் வைப்பதாலோ நிலைமை சீர்திருந்தி விடாது. உடனடியான நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துக் கொள்ளப் பட வேண்டும்.

உணவு தானியங்களின் விலை அதிகமாகக் கொண்டு வருவது ஒரு புறமிருக்க, துணியின் விலையும் ஏறுமுகமாகவே இருக்கிறது. மில் காடாத துணியின் விலை சென்ற வருஷம் ஜூலை மாதத்தில் கஜம் 12½ அணவாக இருந்தது, இப்பொழுது ரூ. 1-1-0-ஆக உயர்ந்திருக்கிறது. வெளுக்கப்பட்ட 81-ம் நெம்பர் நடுத்தர ரக மில் துணி சென்ற வருஷம் ஜூன் மாதத்தில் ரூ. 15-10-0 ஆக இருந்தது, இந்த வருஷம் ரூபாய் 18-3-10 ஆக உயர்ந்திருக்கிறது. மேட்டூர் லாங்கினாத—வெளுக்கப் பட்டது—சென்ற வருஷம் ரூ. 22-11-0-ஆக இருந்தது, இந்த வருஷம் ரூ. 25-6-0 ஆக உயர்ந்திருக்கிறது. அதேபோல எட்டு முழ வெளுத்த வேஷ்டி ஜோடியொன்று ரூ. 7-6-0-ஆக இருந்தது, இந்த வருஷம் ரூபாய் 9-9-6 ஆக உயர்ந்திருக்கிறது. துணியின் விலை இந்த அளவுக்கு உயர்ந்திருக்கிறதேயொழிய அதை உற்பத்தி செய்யும் தொழிலாளிகளுக்கு ஊதியம் உயரவில்லை. துணியின் உற்பத்தி அளவு எப்படியிருக்கிறதென்றால், ஒரு மாதத்திலே என்றுமே இல்லாத அளவுக்கு 48 கோடி கெஜம் உற்பத்தியாயிருப்பிறது என்று பத்திரிகையிலே வந்திருக்கிறது. துணி உற்பத்தி ஜாஸ்தியாகயிருக்கிறதேயொழிய தொழிலாளர்கள் சம்பளம் ஜாஸ்தியாக வில்லை. பருத்திலிலே குறைந்திருக்கிறது. ஆனால், துணியின் விலை ஏறிக் கொண்டே போகிறது. இம்மாதிரி ஏறிக்கொண்டே போவது பொருளாதாரம் சமமாகப் பங்கிடப்படுகிறது என்றதற்கு அத்தரட்சியாகாது. இப்படி யிருந்தால், சாதாரண மக்களுடைய வாழ்க்கைத்தரம் இன்றைக்கு இருக்கும்படியான அளவில் அவர்களுக்கு எப்படி கட்டுப்படியாகும்?

விலைவாசிகள் ஏறிக் கொண்டே போகும் காலத்தில் சர்க்கார் சிப்பந்திகள் “இந்த அநியாய விலையில் நாங்கள் வாழ முடியாது, எங்களுக்குப் பரிசாரம் வேண்டும்” என்று கேட்டால், “நாங்கள் என்ன செய்வது” என்று சர்க்கார் சொல்கிறது என்றால் இதைப்பற்றி நாம் என்ன சொல்வது? விலைவாசிகள் இப்படி ஏறிக்கொண்டு வருவதைப் தடுப்பதற்குப் பதிலாக நாங்கள் என்ன செய்வது என்று சர்க்கார் சொல்வார்களானால், விலைவாசியைக் கட்டுப்படுத்த திராணியில்லாத, திறமையில்லாத ஒரு சர்க்கார் என்றுதான் சொல்ல வேண்டும். விலைவாசிகளைக் கட்டுப்படுத்துவதற்கு எங்களுக்குத் திறமையில்லை, எங்களால் கையாலாகாது என்று சர்க்கார் பகிரங்கமாகவாவது ஒப்புக் கொள்ள வேண்டும். ஒன்று விலைவாசிகளைக் கட்டுப்படுத்த வேண்டும், அல்லது எங்களால் கட்டுப் படுத்த முடியாது என்பதைப் பகிரங்கமாக ஒத்துக் கொள்ள வேண்டும். இந்த இரண்டில் ஒன்றைத்தானே செய்ய வேண்டும். இதைச் சொல்லும்போது எனக்குக் கோபமாகக்கூட இருக்கிறது. நாங்கள் என்ன செய்வது என்று சர்க்கார் மீண்டும் மீண்டும் சொல்லிக் கொண்டே இருப்பதில் என்ன பிரயோஜனம்? நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கப்போகிறோம் என்று சொல்லிக் கொண்டே

13th August 1956] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

யிருப்பதில் என்ன அர்த்தம் இருக்க முடியும்? சர்க்காரால் நடவடிக்கை எடுக்க முடிய வில்லை என்றால், நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கப்போவதில்லை என்று திட்ட வட்டமாகச் சொல்லிவிடுங்கள். விலைவாசிகள் ஏறிக் கொண்டே தான் போகும், நாங்கள் ஒன்றும் செய்யமுடியாது, ஏழை மக்களின் பணம் பதுக்கல்காரர்களின் கைக்குப் போய்க்கொண்டேதான் இருக்கும் என்ற நிலைமையே நீடித்து இருந்தால், பதுக்கல்காரர்களின் கையில் இந்த நாட்டையும் விட்டு விடப் போகிறீர்களா என்று கேட்கின்றேன். ஆகவே, சர்க்கார் திட்ட வட்டமாக தங்களுடைய கொள்கையைத் தெரிவித்து விட வேண்டும். விலைவாசி ஏற்றத்தைத் தடுப்பதற்கு என்ன நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கப் போகிறார்கள் என்பதைத் தெரிவித்துவிடவேண்டும்.

பதுக்கல்காரர்களின் மேல் தீவிர நடவடிக்கை எடுப்பதற்கு சர்க்கார் மறுத்துக் கொண்டிருக்கும் நிலையில் சர்க்காரின் கீழ் வேலை பார்க்கும் சர்க்கார் சிப்பந்திகள் ஆறு மாதங்களுக்குள் விலைவாசி 60 சத முதல் 70 சத விகிதம் வரை ஏறிக் கொண்டே வருகிற தென்பதையும், அரிசி முதல் வாழ்க்கைக்குத் தேவையான சகல சாமான்களின் விலையும் உயர்ந்து வருகிற தென்பதையும் எடுத்துச் சொல்லி, தங்களால் வாழ்க்கை நடத்துவதற்கு முடிய வில்லை யென்றும், தங்களுக்கு அதிகமாக சம்பளம் கொடுக்க வேண்டும், அல்லது ஏதாவது பரிசாரம் செய்ய வேண்டுமென்றும் கேட்டால், முதல் மந்திரி அவர்கள் என்ன சொன்னார் என்பதே நமக்குத் தெரியவில்லை. சபைத் தலைவர் ஒன்று சொல்கிறார். பத்திரிகையிலே ஒரு செய்தி வருகிறது. கனம் முதல் மந்திரி உட்கார்ந்து கொண்டிருக்கிறார். அவர் பதில் சொல்லாமலேயே எங்கிறார். முதல் மந்திரி என்ன சொன்னார் என்பதற்கு நிதி மந்திரி ஏதோ சொல்கிறார். ஆனால், பத்திரிகையிலே மறுப்பு வருகிறது. இப்பொழுது கனம் முதல் அமைச்சரோ வாய்மூடி மொளையாக இருக்கிறார். இப்படியே நிலைமை இருக்குமேயானால் என்ன பிரயோஜனம்? அங்கத்தினர்கள் ஏதாவது வழி சொல்ல வேண்டுமென்று சொல்லப்படுகிறது. நாங்கள் ஏற்கனவே வரி போடுவதற்கான பல வழிகளை எடுத்துக் காட்டியிருக்கிறோம். இனியும் எடுத்துக் காட்டுவதற்குத் தயார். சர்க்கார் அவைகளை ஏற்றுக் கொள்வார்களா? மாட்டார்கள். விலைவாசிகளைக் கட்டுப்படுத்துவதற்கு சர்க்கார் தயாரா என்றால், விலை ஏறிக் கொண்டே யிருந்தால் நாங்கள் ஜவாப் தாரியா? என்று கேட்கப்படுகிறது. சர்க்காருக்குப் பணம் கிடைப்பதற்கு வழிவேண்டுமென்று கூறுகிறார்கள். பல வழிகளைச் சொன்னோம் நாங்கள் சொன்ன யோசனைகள் நன்றாக இருக்கிறதாகவும் அப்பொழுது நிதி மந்திரி அவர்கள் சொன்னார்கள். துரதிருஷ்ட வசமாக கனம் நிதி அமைச்சரவர்களால் மத்திய சர்க்காரை அந்த வழியில் போகும்படி திருப்ப முடியவில்லை. அங்கு வேறு சக்திகள் வேலை செய்கின்றன. அப்பேர்ப்பட்ட நிலைமையில் இந்த நாட்டிலுள்ள என். ஜி. ஒ. க்களின் பிரச்சனையை நம்முடைய சர்க்கார் எப்படித் தீர்க்கப் போகிறார்கள்? சென்னை சர்க்கார் மத்திய சர்க்காரைப் பார்த்து வேண்டுமென்றால் கேட்கவும் தயங்கக் கூடாது. எங்கள் திட்டத்தை நிறைவேற்றுவதற்கு எங்கள் சிப்பந்திகள் நல் வாழ்வு வாழ வேண்டியதவசியம். அவர்களுடைய பிரச்சனையைத் தீர்க்க வேண்டியது அவசியம், அவர்கள்தான் திட்டங்களை நிறைவேற்றுவதற்கு ஜீவாதாமானவர்கள், அவர்களுக்குச் சரியான சம்பளம் கொடுப்பதற்கு எங்களுக்கு வழி செய்து கொடுங்கள் என்று மத்திய சர்க்காரை நமது சர்க்கார் கேட்கட்டும். யார் வேண்டாமென்று சொன்னார்கள்?

தோட்டக் காடுகளுக்கு விவசாய வருமான வரி விதிக்கும்போது சுமார் 75 லட்சம் ரூபாய்தான் வசூலாகும் என்று சென்ற பட்ஜெட்டிலே கணக்கிடப் பட்டது. ஆனால், ஒன்றரை லட்சத்திற்குமேல்? வசூலாயிற்று. ஆகவே, எதிர்பார்த்ததற்கு அதிகமாக இந்த இனத்தில் சர்க்காருக்கு வருமானம் வந்திருக்கிறது. விலைவாசி ஏற்றத்தால் விற்பனை வரி மூலம் அதிகப்பணம் கிடைக்கத்தான் செய்யும். அந்தப் பணத்தையாவது வைத்துக் கொண்டு இவர்களுக்கு உண்டியாக ஏதாவது நிவாரணம் அளிக்கக்கூடாதா? அவர்கள் நிலைமையை சர்க்கார் உணர்ந்திருக்கிறது என்ற ஒரு அத்தாட்சிக்காகவாவது ஏதாவது உடனடி நிவாரணம் அளித்தால்

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

[13th August 1956]

என்.ஜி.ஒக்கள் மனம் கொஞ்சம் திருப்தி அடையும். வேண்டுமென்று அவர்களை திண்டாட விட்டுவிட்டு இப்பொழுது சர்க்கார் இப்படி பதில் சொல்லுவது நியாயமா? அவர்களை இந்த நிலைமைக்கு உள்ளாக்கி விட்டு இப்பொழுது அதை சமாளிக்க 'முடியாமல் திண்டாடவதற்குப் பதிலாக, அவர்களுக்கு முன் கூட்டியே ஏதாவது பரிகாரம் அளித்திருக்கக்கூடாதா? இம்மாதிரி ரசாவாசமாக விவகாரங்களை வைத்துக் கொண்டு என்ன நடக்கிறது என்று பார்த்துக் கொண்டிருப்பது நல்லது அல்ல. (Interruption.) 'பார்க்கலாம்' என்று முதன் மந்திரி சொல்லவில்லையா என்று கேட்ட பொழுது, 'இல்லை' என்றும் பதிலளிக்கப்பட்டு விட்டது. இந்த ரசாவாசமான நிலைமையை மாற்ற உடனடியாக சர்க்கார் நடவடிக்கை எடுத்துக் கொள்ள வேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

நெசவுத் தொழிலாளர்கள் பிரச்னை மிகவும் ஒரு முக்கியமான பிரச்னை. இது சம்பந்தமாக நான் கொடுத்திருக்கக்கூடிய உத்தியோகப் பற்றற்ற ஒரு தீர்மானத்தை வருகிற சனிக்கிழமை 18-ம் தேதியன்று விவாதிக்க கனம் நிதி மந்திரி அவர்கள் ஒத்துக் கொண்டது பற்றி நான் சந்தோஷ மடைகிறேன். அவர் தானாக ஒரு தீர்மானம் கொண்டு வரா விட்டாலும் இந்த விஷயத்தில் ஒத்திழைக்க ஒப்புக் கொண்டது பற்றி சந்தோஷம். இது பற்றி சில முக்கியமான விஷயங்களை மட்டும் தொட்டு விட்டு விரைகிறேன். ஸ்ரீமான் டி. டி. கிருஷ்ணமாச்சாரி அவர்கள் இது விஷயமான கொள்கையை விளக்குகையில் எல்லோருக்கும் திருப்தி ஏற்படும்படி சொல்லி விட்டார். 170 கோடி கெஜம், 30 கோடி கெஜம் மில்களுக்கும், 30 கோடி கெஜம் விசைத் தரிகளுக்கும், பாக்கி 110 கோடி கெஜம் கைத் தறிக்கும் ஒதுக்கி யிருப்பதாகச் சொல்லி விட்டார். ஆனால் நடப்பது என்ன? நட்டக்கப்போவது என்ன? எந்த அடிப்படையில் அவர் இந்தக் கணக்கு போட்டாரோ அந்த அடிப்படையே கோளாறு என்பதற்கு இன்றைக்கு பத்திரிகையில் வந்திருக்கக்கூடிய ஒரு செய்தியே சான்று. இன்று நமது நாட்டில் இருக்கக்கூடிய மில்களின் சக்தியைக்கொண்டு 600 கோடி கெஜம் உற்பத்தி செய்ய முடியும். இரண்டாவது ஐந்தாண்டுத் திட்டக் காலத்தில் மேலும் 140 கோடி கெஜம் மக்களுக்கு தேவைப்படுமென்றும், 30 கோடி கெஜம் வெளிநாடுகளுக்கு ஏற்றுமதிக்காக தேவைப்படுமென்றும், ஆக மொத்தமாக 170 கோடி கெஜம் தேவைப்படும் என்று கணக்கு போடப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. நேற்றைய தினம் "மெயில்" பத்திரிகையில் வந்திருக்கக்கூடிய சர்க்கார் செய்தியைப் பார்த்தால், ஜூலை மாதத்தில் மட்டும் மில்களின் மூலமாக 48 கோடி கெஜம் உற்பத்தியாகி யிருப்பதாகத் தெரிகிறது. ஒரு மாதத்தில் 48 கோடி கெஜம் உற்பத்திச் செய்யக்கூடிய சக்தி மில்களுக்கு இருக்கிறது என்றால், 12 மாதங்களில் அவைகள் எவ்வளவு உற்பத்தி செய்யக்கூடும்? ஒரு வருஷத்துக்கு 500 கோடி செஜத்துக்கு மேல் உற்பத்தி செய்ய முடியாது என்று சொல்லப்பட்டதே? மில்களுக்கு 30 கோடி கெஜம் உற்பத்தி செய்வதற்குத்தான் லைசென்ஸ் கொடுத்தார்கள். கிட்டத்தட்ட வருஷத்துக்கு 630 கோடி கெஜம் உற்பத்தி செய்யக் கூடிய சக்தி மில்களுக்கு இருக்கிறது. 1954-ல் அஹமதாபாத்தில் தகராறு வந்தபொழுது, இன்னும் அதிகமாக துணி உற்பத்தி செய்வதற்கு லைசென்ஸ் கொடுக்க வேண்டுமென்று கேட்ட பொழுது மில் முதலாளிகள் 500 கோடி கெஜத்துக்கு மேல் உற்பத்தி யில்லை என்று உறுதி கூறினார்கள். இப்பொழுது லைசென்ஸ் கிடைத்த பிறகு அடுத்த மாதமே உற்பத்தி அதிகரித்து விட்டது. லைசென்ஸ் கொடுத்ததற்கு அதிகமாக மில்கள் உற்பத்தி செய்தால் கைத்தறித் துணிகள் விற்பனை யாகாமல் போய்விடலாம். கனம் ஸ்ரீ சி. சுப்ரமணியம் சென்ற மாதம் கூட்டுறவு சங்கப் பிரதிநிதிகள் மகா நாட்டுக்குப் போயிருந்தார். கூட்டத் திற்கு வந்திருந்த ஒவ்வொரு பிரதிநிதிகளும் எங்களுடைய கூட்டுறவு சங்கத்தில் 6 மாதங்களாக ஸ்பாக்குகள் வளர்ந்துக்கொண்டே இருக்கின்றன. குறைந்த பட்சம் எங்களிடம் இருக்கக்கூடிய ஸ்பாக்கில் மூன்றில் ஒரு பங்கையாவது மாகாண் கூட்டுறவு சங்கம் எடுத்துக் கொண்டு விற்பனைக்கு ஏற்பாடு செய்ய வேண்டுமென்று சொல்லி அது மாதிரி தீர்மானம் கூட நிறைவேற்றினார்கள். ஆனால் மாகாண் கூட்டுறவு சங்கம் அதற்கு ஒத்துக் கொள்ளாமல், நஷ்டத்துக்கு மற்ற சங்கங்கள் விற்பதற்குத் தயாராக யிருந்தால் எடுத்துக் கொள்ளுவதாகச் சொல்லி விட்டது.

13th August 1956] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

இந்த நிலைமை இன்றைக்கே ஏற்பட்டு விட்டது. நிலைமை இப்படி இருக்கும் பொழுது, மில் முதலாளிகள் காட்டிய பொய் கணக்கை சரியாக பரிசீலனை செய்யாமல், மேலே சொன்னபடி கொள்கை வகுக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. நிச்சயமாக இதனால் நம் மாகாணத்தில் இருக்கக்கூடிய கைத் தறி நெசவாளர்கள் பாதிக்கப்படுவார்கள். ஆகவே இந்தக் கணக்கு பொய்க் கணக்கு என்று மெய்ப்பிக்கப்பட்டு விட்டது. இது மிகப் பெரிய ஆபத்தில் கொண்டு போய் விடும். இரண்டாவது ஐந்தாண்டுத் திட்டம் பரிசீலனையில் இருக்கும் பொழுது ஐன் வரையில் இந்தக் கொள்கை வகுக்கப் பட வில்லை. பார்லிமெண்டில் இந்தத் திட்டம் சமர்ப்பிக்கப்பட்ட காலத்தில் நிச்சயமாக ஒன்றும் தெரியவில்லை. போன மாதத்தில் தான் இந்தக் கொள்கை உறுவாக்கப்பட்டது. இது விஷயமாக கைத்தறி போர்டு டன் கலந்து ஆலோசிக்கவில்லை. ஆகையால் இப்பொழுது நிலைமை என்ன, நிலைமையை சமாளிக்க என்ன செய்யவேண்டும், எந்தத் திட்டத்தை வகுத்தால் நலனையிருக்கும் என்று ஆலோசிக்க வேண்டிய காலகட்டத்தில் இருக்கிறோம். இது விஷயமாக பின்னால் பேசிக் கொள்ளலாம்.

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

கடைசியில் கவர்னர் அவர்கள் தன்னுடைய பிரச்சித்தத்தில் நாட்டில் பொதுவாக ஓடுகின்ற அமைதி நிலைமை நன்றாக இருக்கிறது என்று குறிப்பிட்டிருக்கிறார். ஆனால் டெல்லி பிரதேசங்களில் கொஞ்சம் நிலைமை தவறியிருக்கிறது என்று சொல்லியிருக்கிறார். ஆனால் நிலைமை அப்படித் தவறியதற்கு என்ன காரணம் என்பதைமட்டும் அவர் சொல்லவில்லை. உதாரணமாக சிதம்பரம் தாலுகாவில் ஏற்பட்டுள்ள விவசாயத் தகராறை எடுத்துக்கொள்ளலாம். அங்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய மிராசதார் விவசாயிக்கு சட்டபூர்வமாக என்ன வாரம் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமோ அதைக் கொடுக்காத தால் தகராறு மூண்டது. கடைசியில் செட்டிமெண்டுக்கு வரும்பொழுது சட்டபூர்வமாக என்ன வாரம் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமோ அதைக் கொடுக்க வேண்டுமென்றுதான் ஏற்பட்டது. ஏதாவது தகராறு வந்தால் முதலில் விவசாயிகளுக்குக் கிடைப்பது விசேஷ ஆயுதம் தாங்கிய மலபார் போலீஸ் தான். ஆனால் அதே சமயத்தில் மிராசதார் என்ன அக்கிரமம் செய்தாலும் கேள்வி முறை கிடைப்பது. அப்பொழுது எந்த விதத்திலும் போலீஸார் நடவடிக்கை எடுக்க மாட்டார்கள். மதரையில் இன்னொரு உதாரணம் கொடுக்கிறேன். அங்கே சோழவந்தானில் ஒரு மிராசதார்—அவர் பெயரையும் ஊரையும் நான் சொல்ல விரும்பவில்லை—நிலத்தில் இருக்கக் கூடிய விவசாயியை வெளியேற்றவேண்டுமென்று நினைத்தார். ஆனால் அதற்கு சட்டம் இடம் கொடுக்கவில்லை. அவருக்கு சர்க்கார் காரியாலயத்தில் ஒரு சொந்தக்கார ஐ.ஏ.எஸ். ஆபீசர் இருக்கிறார்.

Immediately thereafter, there was a humming sound emanating from the sound equipment.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : Sir, may I know what is wrong in the House? We just now heard a noise that is almost threatening us. Anything may happen and we are afraid that the fans may fall upon us. (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKER : The hon. Member can take courage that nothing will happen. (Renewed laughter.)

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : அந்த ஐ.ஏ.எஸ். ஆபீசர் லீவில் போய் 11-08 அங்கு இருக்கிற Dy.S.P., D.S.P. முதலிய போலீஸ் உத்தியோகஸ்தர்களை பார்த்திருக்கிறார். உடனே டெபுடி கலெக்டரிடம் விவசாயி சம்பந்தப்பட்ட வரையில் சமாதானத்துக்கு பங்கம் ஏற்பட்டு விடுமென்று சொல்லி section 145, Criminal Procedure Code-ன் கீழ் மனுச் செய்து கொள்ளப்பட்டது. உடனே 'நிலம் உன் கையில் இருக்கிறது என்பதை ருசுப்படுத்து' என்ற உத்திரவு விவசாயிக்குப் போடப்பட்டது. 8.11.

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

[13th August 1956]

145-வது செக்ஷன் கீழ் அவ்வளவுதான் செய்ய முடியும். ரூசப்படுத்த மனு தாக்கல் செய்வதுதான் சாத்தியம். இந்த உத்திரவு போடப்பட்டவுடனே, மிராசதாரருக்கு சாதகமாக போலீஸ் அங்கே அனுப்பப்பட்டு, விவசாயியானவன் நிலத்தில் இறங்கக்கூடாது, விவகாரம் தீருகிறவரைக்கும் சாகுபடி செய்யக்கூடாது என்று தடுத்து நிறுத்தப்பட்டிருக்கிறார்கள்.

SRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN : எவ்வளவு ஏக்கர் சமாசாரம்?

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : ஐந்து ஏக்கர் சமாசாரம்தான். 145-வது செக்ஷன்படி விவசாயி நிலத்தில் இறங்கக்கூடாது என்று சொல்லுவதற்கு அதிகாரம் கிடையாது. மாஜிஸ்ட்ரேட் என்ன சொல்லுகிறார்? நீ தான் possession-ல் இருக்கிறாய் என்று ரூசப்படுத்து என்று சொல்லுகிறார். இந்த நோட்டீஸ் வந்தவுடனே 4 போலீஸ்காரர்கள் போய் “நீ நிலத்தில் இறங்கக்கூடாது” என்று விவசாயியை தடுத்து கோர்ட்டில் போய் ரூச பண்ணிக்கொண்டுரோ என்று ஆரம்பிக்கிறார்கள். 15, 20 நாள் இப்படி விவசாயியை இழுத்தடித்தால், சாகுபடியெல்லாம் முடிந்த பிறகு அவன் ரூசப்படுத்தினாலும், இந்த வருஷத்திய வருமானம் அவனுக்கு ஒழிந்தது. இந்த மாதிரி முறைகள் போலீஸ் இலாக்காவால் எவ்வளவோ இடங்களில் அனுஷ்டிக்கப்பட்டு வருகின்றன. இந்த மாதிரி எதை எடுத்தாலும் இன்றைக்கு ஒழுங்குப் பிரச்சனை அமைதிப் பிரச்சனை என்று ஏற்படுத்திக்கொண்டுபோனால், நிலைமை என்னவாகும் என்பதை யோசித்துப் பார்க்கவேண்டும். போலீஸ் இலாக்கா இந்த நிலவெளியேற்ற தடுப்புச் சட்டம் யாருடைய நன்மைக்காக போடப்பட்டிருக்கிறது என்பதை உணர்ந்து, இந்த சட்ட விஷயமாக அவையசியமாக மிராசதாரர்களுக்கு சாதகமாக குறிக்கிராமல், சட்டத்தை நன்றாக படித்துப்பார்த்து, விவகாரங்கள் ஏதாவது வந்தால் ரெவின்யூ கோர்ட்டுக்கு போய் கொள்ளுங்கள் என்று சொல்லவேண்டிய நிலைமையில் D.S.P. கள் வரவேண்டும். இதற்கு வேண்டிய உத்திரவை போடும்படி சென்னை சர்க்காரை கேட்டுக் கொள்ளுகிறேன். இன்று எதையெடுத்தாலும் Law and Order பிரச்சனையாக கருதப்பட்டு, சட்டத்தை உண்மையாக மீறுகிறவர்கள், மிராசதாரர்கள் தப்புவதால், சட்டத்தை நிறைவேற்றவேண்டுமென்று கேட்கக் கூடிய விவசாயி, ஒழுங்குக்கும் அமைதிக்கும் விரோதமாக நடந்து கொள்ளுகிறான் என்று கூறப்படும் நிலைமை இந்த மாகாணத்தில் நாளுக்கு நாள் வளர்ந்துகொண்டு வருகிறது.

அடுத்தபடியாக, விற்பனை வரி சம்பந்தமாக சில வார்த்தைகள் சொல்ல விரும்புகிறேன். ஒரு முனை விற்பனை வரி விதிக்க சில சர்க்குகளை பொறுக்கியிருக்கிறார்கள். மோட்டார்கார், சிமெண்டு, கிரோவின் ஆயில், காப்பி, டீ, இது மாதிரி சர்க்குகளை பார்த்து பொறுக்கியிருக்கிறார்கள். மோட்டார்கார் சாதாரண ஜனங்கள் வாங்கக்கூடிய சர்க்கில்லை. இதை வாங்கி விற்கக் கூடியவர்களும், சாதாரணமாக கடைக்காரர்கள் அல்ல. T.V.S போன்ற பெரிய முதலாளிகள்தான். T.V.S. காரர்களுக்கு இப்போதிருக்கும் sales tax முறையால் பெரிய தொந்தரவு ஏற்பட்டிருக்காது. என்றாலும், இந்த மாதிரியான சர்க்குகளைப்பார்த்து பொறுக்கியெடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள். ஒரு முனை விற்பனை வரி வேண்டுமென்று செய்யும் படியான கிளர்ச்சியின் அஸ்திவாரமென்ன? இப்போது இருக்கும் படியான பலகட்ட விற்பனை வரி, சாதாரண வியாபாரிகளுக்கு பெரிய தொந்தரவை ஏற்படுத்திக் கொண்டு வருகிறது. அதை தடுத்து நிறுத்தவேண்டுமென்பதற்குத் தான் கிளர்ச்சி, இதை நாங்களும் ஒப்புக்கொள்ளுகிறோம். அவர்கள் தொந்தரவை நீக்கத்தான் பரிட்சார்த்தமாக சில பொருள்களின் மீது ஒரு முனை விற்பனை வரியை அமுலுக்கு கொண்டுவருகிறோம் என்று சொல்லுகிறது சர்க்கார். உண்மையில், சர்க்கார் கண்ணோட்டத்தில் பார்த்தாலும் கூட, இன்னும் எவ்வளவோ சர்க்குகளுக்கு ஒரு முனை விற்பனை வரி போட முடியும். பருத்திக்கொட்டை விற்பனை ஆகிறது. இது ஸீட்டில் அரைப்பது கிடையாது. Ginning factory-ல் அரைக்கப்பட்டு, அங்கேயிருந்து விற்பனைக்குவருகிறது. அந்த இடத்தில் போடமுடியாதா ஒரு முனை விற்பனை வரி? பிண்ணுக்கு, மரச்செக்கில் ஆடவெதிலில். அது மில்லில் உண்டாக்கக்கூடியது. அதற்குதான் வரி, மில்களில் உண்டாக்கப்பட்டு வெளியே

13th August 1956]

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

போகக்கூடிய காலத்தில் ஒரு முனை வரி போடமுடியாதா? காபி எல்லோரும் உபயோகிக்கிற பொருள் அல்ல. அதற்கு ஒரு முனை வரி இருந்தாலும் இருந்துபோகட்டும். விவசாயிகள், சாதாரண மக்கள், மற்றவர்கள் உபயோகிக்கும்படியான நூற்றுக்கணக்கான பண்டங்கள் இருக்கின்றன. அவற்றிற்கு ஒரு முனை வரி விதிக்க முடியும். இரும்புச் சாமான்களை எடுத்துக்கொள்ளுங்கள். பட்டரையில் உற்பத்தியாகிறது. சில சாமான்கள், நூற்றுக்கணக்கான மக்கள் உபயோகப்படுத்தும், ஏகப்பட்டது இருக்கிறது. கோயம்புத்தூர் போன்ற இடங்களில் உற்பத்தியாகிறது. அந்த இடத்தில் போடலாம் ஒரு முனை வரி, இன்னும் சில சாமான்கள் டாட்டா கம்பெனியில் இருந்து வருகிற தென்னூல், நாகப்பட்டணத்தில் ஸ்ரீ ராஜம் ராமஸ்வாமிக்கு சொந்தமான தொழிற்சாலையிலிருந்து உற்பத்தியாகி வருகிற தென்னூல், அங்கே போட முடியும். இந்த மாதிரி நூற்றுக்கணக்கான சரக்குகள் இருக்கின்றன. இவைகளை பரிசீலனை செய்து பார்ப்பதற்கு சர்க்கார் அதிகாரிகளுக்கு திராணிமில்லையா? யோசித்துப்பார்க்கவேண்டும். என் உடனடியாக அப்படிச் செய்து, ஜனங்களுடைய நம்பிக்கையை பெறக்கூடாது, நல்லெண்ணத்தை பெறக்கூடாது என்று கேட்க ஆணைப்படுகிறேன். ஆகவே இன்றைக்கு போட்டிருக்கக்கூடிய உத்திரவை, நீண்ட கால தாமதம் செய்யாமல் மாற்றியமைத்து, இன்னும் பல சாமான்களைச் சேர்த்து ஒரு முனை விற்பனை வரிபோட, பூரண முயற்சி நாங்கள் செய்து கொண்டு வருகிறோம் என்பதற்கு சர்க்கார் ஒரு உத்திரவாதம் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்ள விரும்புகிறேன்.

கடைசியாக சர்க்கார் அனுஷ்டிக்கும்படியான தொழிற் கொள்கையைப்பற்றி ஒரு வார்த்தை. நமது தொழில் மந்திரி இருக்கிறாரே அவர் சமீபத்தில் தொழில் அதிகாரிகளை (Labour officers) கூட்டிவைத்து மகாநாடு நடத்தினார். அதில் அவர் என்ன சொன்னார் தெரியுமா? அந்த மகாநாட்டில் இருக்கக்கூடிய தொழில் அதிகாரிகள் எல்லோரும், “முதலாளிகள் சட்டத்தை மீறுகிறார்கள், அவர்கள் மீது நடவடிக்கை யெடுக்க வேண்டிய அதிகாரத்தை அளிக்கவேண்டும்” என்று கேட்கக்கூடிய காலத்தில் கனம் மந்திரி கூறினார்: “முதலாளிகள் சட்டத்தை மீறினால், நடவடிக்கையெடுக்கும்போது அவர்களுக்கு தொந்திரவு விளைக்காமல் இருக்க வேண்டும்” என்று. முதலாளிகளுக்கு தொந்திரவு விளைக்காமல் அந்த அதிகாரிகள் என்ன நடவடிக்கையெடுக்கமுடியும்? தொழிலாளியென்றால் ஜெயிலுக்கு அனுப்பலாம், உதைக்கலாம். ஆனால் சட்டத்தை மீறும் படியான முதலாளிகளுக்கு தொந்திரவு விளைக்காமல் நடவடிக்கை எடுக்க வேண்டுமென்றால், அதன் விளைவு எங்கே கொண்டு போகும்? ஒரே ஒரு உதாரணத்தை அந்த சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் சொல்லுகிறேன். மதுரையில் மோஹன்ராம் நிட்டிங் பாக்டரி (Mohanram Knitting Factory) என்று பெண்கள் வேலை செய்யும் ஒரு factory இருக்கிறது. அந்த பாக்டரி பூட்டப்பட்டது. அந்த பாக்டரியில் வேலை செய்யும் பெண்கள், தங்களுக்கு சட்டரீதியாக கிடைக்கவேண்டிய சம்பளம் கிடைக்கவேண்டுமென்பதற்காக மனுப்போட்டு இரண்டு வருஷத்திற்கு மேலாகிவிட்டது. அதை வாங்கிக் கொடுக்க சர்க்கார் முன் வரவில்லை. சர்க்காருக்கு, இன்று இருக்கும்படியான சட்டத்தின்கீழ் அந்த பெண் தொழிலாளர்களுக்கு கிடைக்க வேண்டிய சம்பளத் தொகையை Revenue dues மாதிரி வசூலிக்க அதிகாரம் இருக்கிறது என்பது தெரியும். மீண்டும் மீண்டும் அந்தப் பெண்கள் மனுபோட்டும்சூட, சர்க்கார் ஒரு நடவடிக்கையும் எடுக்கவில்லை. ஆகவே அவர்கள் ஊர்வலமாகச்சென்று கலெக்டரை போய் பார்த்தார்கள். அப்படி பார்ப்பதும் காலத்தில், கலெக்டர் சொல்லுகிறார்கள். “1950-ம் வருஷத்தில் மீனாட்சி மில்லில் ஏற்பட்ட வேலை நிறுத்தத்தின்போது, தொழிலாளிகளுக்கு சர்க்கார் பண உதவியளித்தது. அதைத் திருப்பி வாங்கிக்கொடுத்தால் நாங்கள் உங்களுக்கு கிடைக்கவேண்டிய சம்பளத்தை வசூலிக்க நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கிறோம்” என்று கூறுகிறார்கள். இந்த மாதிரி முதலாளிகளிடமேல் நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கமாட்டோம் என்கிற கொள்கையை அனுஷ்டித்து, எப்படி இந்த நாட்டில் தொழில் அமைதியை நிலைநாட்டுவது என்பது சாத்தியம்? ஒன்று சட்டம் போடாமல் இருக்கவேண்டும். அல்லது சட்டம் போட்டால் அதை நிலைநாட்டவேண்டிய தைரியத்துடன் சர்க்கார் முன்வரவேண்டும்.

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

[13th August 1956]

ஆகவே, இந்த கொள்கை இருக்கும் வரையில், இதன் விளைவு எங்கே கொண்டு போய் விடுமென்றால், நான் ஏற்கனவே கூறியதுமாதிரி, இந்த இரண்டாவது ஐந்தாண்டு திட்டத்தின் முக்கியமான லட்சியம் இருக்கிறதே, அதாவது பணம், வருமானம் இவற்றில் ஜனங்களிடையே இருக்கக்கூடிய ஏற்றத்தாழ்வை சமம் ஆக்க, இன்றைக்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய அசமத்துவம் ஓரளவிற்கு நீர்க்கக்கூடிய சூழ் நிலையை சிருஷ்டிக்கவேண்டுமென்ற லட்சியம் அது வெறும் எட்டளவிலே இருக்கக்கூடிய நிலையில்தான் கொண்டு செல் லப்போகிறது. நடைமுறையில் முதல் ஐந்தாண்டு திட்டத்தின் விளைவால் என்ன நிலைமை ஏற்பட்டது? பணக்காரர்கள் மேலும் பணக்காரர்கள் ஆனார்கள், ஏழைகள் மேலும் ஏழைகளானார்கள் என்று நான் குறிப்பிட்ட போது, ஸ்ரீ சி. சுப்ரமணியம் போனதடவை அதை ஒத்துக்கொண்டார். அதே நிலைமை ஏற்பட்டுக்கொண்டிருக்கிறது இன்றைக்கும். ஆகவே திட்டத்தை நிறைவேற்றுவதற்கு அடிப்படையாகவாவது இந்த மிகவும் முக்கியமான கோளாறை நீக்க, விலைவாசிகளை ஒரு நிலையான கட்டத்தில், நியாயமான கட்டத்தில் நிறுத்தவேண்டும். அத்தோடு மட்டுமல்லாமல், speculator-களுக்கு எதிராக நடவடிக்கை எடுக்க சர்க்கார் தயங்குவார்களேயானால், திட்டம் அதோகதியாகிவிடும் என்று எச்சரிக்கை செய்து, இந்த எதிர் மறையிலிருந்து கீழே குதிக்க உடனடியாக சர்க்கார் முனவரவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டு, என்னுடைய பேச்சை முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Mr. Speaker, Sir, before I proceed to deal with the problems raised during the debate, you will permit me to refer to our beloved President's visit to our State. On behalf of the Members of this House and on my own behalf—I hope all the Members of this House will agree with me and permit me to extend to him a warm welcome—I extend to him a very hearty welcome and also convey our respectful greetings (cheers). We are particularly happy that he will be with us during the Independence Day celebrations. That celebration has a particular significance for all of us and participation of the President also has a significance emphasising the unity of the country and I hope the President will not only have a happy stay in our State but will have also a very useful stay and contribute to the good feelings in the midst of our people.

The Governor's Address was criticized on the ground that it did not contain many things which ought to have been mentioned and that it has not mentioned anything with regard to the future policy which the Government would be pursuing. I think the hon. Member Sri S. Swayamprakasam made particular mention about it. Hon. Members would remember why we decided to have the Governor's Address just in the middle of the year rather than in the beginning of the year. We wanted to avoid two major speeches, one by H.E. Governor and one by the Finance Minister during the Budget Session and the discussion also centering round the same subjects. That is why we wanted to have the Governor's Address in the middle of the year when we would have started implementing the various proposals contained in the Budget and we wanted to give an idea to the hon. Members as to how far we have begun implementing the various schemes formulated in the Budget. That is why the Governor's Address contains information with regard to the various steps we had taken in implementing the Budget proposals. After all, what we intend doing during the year

13th August 1956]

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

has been settled during the Budget and we cannot go far beyond that. It may be that we may be taking up some new schemes here and there, but, by and large, we will have to confine ourselves to the Budget scheme as such and particularly after the plan and the Budget also following that plan, it will become almost impossible to have any new striking schemes introduced during the course of the year and therefore I do plead that it may not be justifiable on the part of hon. Members to expect from the Governor's Address new pronouncements with regard to new schemes or new policies when he is addressing the House in the midst of the year.

Another unusual feature which has arisen in the discussion of this Governor's Address is that we have to refer also to the Address of the Governor of another State. It is a rather unfortunate position. I am referring to the Address delivered by the Governor of Andhra to the Legislative Assembly of Andhra. I think I should straightaway deal with this problem, because it has been exercising the minds of hon. Members. At the outset I do confess that our Government have not been able to implement their various assurances that this problem would be solved by a particular date. Now that it is mentioned in the Andhra Governor's Address as a policy of the Andhra Government, it is necessary for me to take this House into my confidence and place before it the relevant facts which will show where the difficulty of the problem lies and why it has not been possible to solve the problem expeditiously. Hon. Members are aware of the Prime Minister's statement and also the Home Minister's statement on the floor of the Lok Sabha in 1953 with regard to the appointment of a Boundary Commission for settling the border disputes between the Andhra and Madras States. When this question was taken up later on and it was suggested that the border disputes should be immediately discussed and settled, a suggestion was made by the then Andhra Governor that this matter also could be referred to the States Reorganization Commission, which was contemplated at that time. We categorically stated that that Commission should have nothing to do with this problem which had arisen out of a partition which had already taken place and about which the Prime Minister had given certain assurances, which assurances had been endorsed on the floor of the Lok Sabha by the Home Minister. Therefore this matter was not referred to the States Reorganization Commission. If hon. Members had gone through the Commission's Report, they would find that the Commission had specifically stated that they were not concerned with this matter and that this was a matter for settlement between the Andhra and the Madras Governments. Therefore the Commission's proceedings either at the investigation stage or at the report stage had nothing to do with the boundary disputes between Andhra and Madras. That is the sum and substance of the proposal made for referring the matter to the States Reorganization Commission. Therefore the Madras Government expected that it should be settled as a problem separate from the problems arising out of the State reorganization. Having agreed to it, it was pointed out that it was necessary to re-sort the population figures in the

11-20
a.m.

• [Sri C. Subramaniam] [13th August 1956]

Andhra and the Madras States on the basis of the language spoken. A special officer was appointed with the consent of the Andhra and Madras Governments, and the re-sorting of the population figures was done. It took a long time, because it was a laborious task. Unfortunately, during the re-sorting of the figures, the Andhra Ministry fell and the President's rule came into existence. A general election was pending. Even though we wanted to expedite the settlement of the border disputes, nothing could be done because no elected ministry was in existence in that State. Meanwhile, the re-sorting of the figures with regard to the Tamil-speaking and Telugu-speaking population in the various villages was done, the percentage was worked out and a map also was prepared. Then the present Andhra Government was formed. When the Chief Minister of Andhra visited Madras soon after the formation of the Andhra Government, I had an informal discussion with him, and it was agreed that this matter should be talked over between the two Governments and an amicable settlement arrived at. Hon. Members might remember that after these talks, the Chief Minister of Andhra gave a Press statement to the effect that it should be possible for the two Governments to arrive at an amicable settlement by mutual discussion and that there would not be any necessity to ask a third party to intervene to bring about a settlement. Soon after this Press statement, I wrote a letter to him on the following lines :—

“ The statement you made from Kurnool on the 30th of June about border adjustment has been well featured in the local Press and has given much satisfaction, especially in the border areas. It is desirable that we proceed to settle the matter amicably in the present favourable atmosphere and let us hope to do this without bringing in any third party. Before the respective Ministers of the two Governments sit together in a conference, it may perhaps be necessary for a committee of four officials, two of each Government, to scrutinize the data and, if possible, to draw up a rough demarcation line. The officers may be given the following broad instructions :—

(1) The boundary line may be a continuous one and isolated pockets should be avoided to the extent practicable.

(2) Village should be the unit for consideration and partition of villages should be avoided.

(3) Villages with over 50 per cent Telugu-speaking people should be incorporated in the Andhra State to the extent practicable and *vice versa*.

(4) Due consideration may be given to geographical features such as hills, forests and rivers as constituting natural boundaries between the two States and to economic features, such as irrigation sources and their ayacuts being in the same State.”

13th August 1956] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

I received the following reply on the 7th July 1955 :—

“ Your letter regarding re-adjustment of the Andhra-Madras border is duly received and your suggestions seem to be very reasonable. I shall write to you about it a little later.”

Later on I received a more detailed letter accepting the four principles that have been laid down and also adding another point with regard to multi-lingual areas, that is, areas where no people speaking a particular language were in a majority. For example, there is the Hosur area where the Telugus are not in a majority, the Tamils are not in a majority, and the Kannadigas are not in a majority. It is a trilingual area or a multi-lingual area. Reference was made to this. They wanted that those areas wherein the Telugus were predominant over any other language group should be handed over to the Andhras. In answer to this, we said that that might not be proper, that Madras continued to be a multi-lingual State in spite of the partition of Andhra, and therefore that that method would not be adopted. Still we were prepared to discuss the question. Instead of the officers meeting and discussing the question, we said the Ministers along with their officers could meet and have a discussion. We did have a conference here. What is most important is the communique we issued after we had a discussion between the two Governments. There was difference of opinion regarding the Hosur area. This is the joint communique issued by the Chief Ministers of Andhra and Madras :

11-30
a.m.

“ The discussions between the representatives of the Madras and the Andhra Governments over the disputed border areas between the two States continued to-day. The Andhra Ministers urged that Hosur taluk also should be discussed along with the other affected taluks, but the Madras Ministers could not agree to this as, in their view, the problems of Hosur taluk, where no language has an absolute majority, are quite distinct from those which arise in respect of other taluks. It was agreed that as desired by the Andhra Ministers, the Government of Andhra should have time till the end of this month to consider the matter and say whether they would agree to have Hosur taluk considered separately or ask for a Boundary Commission to give a decision in respect of all the taluks including Hosur taluk.”

What was settled in the conference was that if the Andhra Government was agreeable to isolate the question of Hosur and take up the other question, then we could sit down and settle the matter. If not, the alternative contemplated was the appointment of a Boundary Commission to give a decision in respect of the taluks including the Hosur taluk. This was the agreement reached, and this was the joint communique that was issued. Then on the 29th November 1955, we received the communication from the Chief Minister of Andhra :

“ As agreed to at the Inter-State Conference held at Madras on the 4th instant, the Andhra Government have carefully re-examined the question of re-adjustment of the State boundaries with Madras, and we feel that it is necessary that the entire border

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [13th August 1956]

dispute with Madras should be discussed and settled at one time and no piecemeal adjustment is desirable. The stand already taken by this Government in the matter has therefore to be reiterated."

Therefore, they were not willing to isolate the question of Hosur and have it considered separately. The only alternative then was the appointment of a Boundary Commission. So, we immediately wrote on 1—12—1955 to the Government of India stating that the talks had broken down and therefore the only course left open was the appointment of a Boundary Commission. In our letter to the Government of India, we had dealt with Hosur and other problems. The Andhra Government in their turn wrote to the Government of India refuting some of our points with reference to Hosur. In that communication also it was not stated that a uniform policy should be adopted with reference to the various border areas which might arise with reference to the States Reorganization Commission Report and the implementation of that report. But what they wanted was this. They wanted time till decisions were taken with reference to the Reorganization Commission Report so that they might know the stand they had to take in regard to Hosur. I think this was intended to know whether they would be getting Kolar or not. Because, it was understood and it was almost agreed that if Andhra Government were not getting Kolar, then their case with reference to Hosur might not be quite tenable. That is why they wanted to know the final decisions with regard to the Reorganization Commission Report. It was not indicated that this question should be taken up after the reorganization of all the States and considered along with all the boundary problems arising with reference to the general reorganization of all the States. But for the first time, this is the stand taken up by them later on.

It was rather unfortunate that when correspondence was going on between the two Governments, they should have chosen to announce their policy in the Governor's Address. Sir, I respectfully submit that we have to realise what should be put in the Governor's Address and what should not be put. If it becomes necessary for a legislature to discuss the Address of the Governor delivered to another Assembly, I think we should be cautious here. Here is a matter which should not be put in the mouth of a Governor as enunciating the policy of the Government. I respectfully submit that the statement of the Andhra Government has crossed, if I may say so, the bounds of inter-State propriety. I am not trying to accuse anybody. We do not know and we have not set up conventions as to the contents of a Governor's Address. But this is one great lesson to be learnt by everybody. Particularly if it is a matter of inter-State dispute, which has not been settled and which is still under correspondence and negotiations are going on between the two Governments, to put that matter as a matter of policy of the Government in the Governor's Address, is bound to lead to difficulties. That is why we are in the unenviable position of not confining our discussions to our Governor's Address

13th August 1956]

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

but referring to the Governor's Address of an altogether different State. I am sure that if only they devoted some thought to this aspect, these things could have been avoided. No doubt there are bound to be inter-State disputes in the future. But unless we set up healthy conventions with reference to the Governor's Address, we will find ourselves in the same predicament in future also. Therefore, I would respectfully submit in all humility—it is not that I want to teach the Andhra Government what they should put in the Governor's Address—that we have to set up healthy conventions avoiding references in Governor's Addresses to matters that would lead to difficulties and embarrassment.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI: Quite apart from the question of propriety of the Andhra Government having referred to this matter, the question unfortunately has been referred to here. From the statement made by the Hon. Minister here, it is quite evident that the Andhra Government are going back on certain accepted principles which are there on paper. So when this new stand is taken, then the question of Andhra-Madras border can be settled only if the Central Government lay down a principle for the settlement of all border disputes throughout India. If they have not stated the basis, what is the view of the Madras Government on this question?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: I am coming to that. I am now stating certain facts. We found ourselves in an unenviable position. While negotiations were going on, an announcement of a policy decision was made by the Andhra Government that as far as they were concerned, they did not recognize all that had happened till now and therefore they would like to have some new principles adopted by the Government of India which should be applicable to these disputes. That is why, immediately after the Andhra Governor's Address became known to us, we wrote to the Government of India again pointing out that matters had been made worse by a reference to this dispute in the Governor's Address and that therefore it was necessary to take an immediate decision in this matter. Sir, as far as I am concerned, I confess that I am not a fanatic in regard to linguistic matters, whether it be a virtue or vice, whatever that may be.

But, I am concerned with the people living in those areas. As far as I am concerned—though some other people might be exercised over it—it does not matter to me whether a certain village or villages are included in the Andhra or Madras State. My own view is, wherever we are, it should be possible for us to carry on smoothly. It should be possible for us to have those fundamental rights guaranteed under the Constitution fully safeguarded in whichever State we may be living. But, here is a State where they are in a state of suspense and uncertainty. They do not know where they would be, whether they would be in the Andhra State or whether they would be transferred to the Madras State. This sort of uncertainty and suspense create difficulties not only for the

11-40
a.m.

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[13th August 1956]

people, but also for the Government. So far as the Madras Government are concerned, they may be under the impression that a particular area might be handed over to them and they may feel that necessary steps will have to be taken only later on for the purpose of development of that area. As far as the people are concerned, because of the uncertainty, they do not know where their loyalties should be; they do not know whether they should be loyal to the Andhra Government or whether they should behave in such a manner as to show that they have Tamil loyalties. Thus there would be a state of conflict for the people affected and for the Government also. So, apart from any other thing, I am interested in seeing that a decision is reached as immediately as possible. We have waited sufficiently long, nearly for three years. Therefore, it is necessary that a decision should be reached with reference to the boundary disputes as early as possible. I say this not with a view to adding a certain territory to the Madras State or for snatching away a particular territory from the Andhra State. I feel that it is necessary that in the interests of the Madras Government, in the interests of the Andhra Government and in the interests of the people living in those areas, a quick decision should be taken. As far as I am concerned, I do not mind in what way the decision goes. It should be a decision which will do full justice to all parties concerned. If we are not able to agree, the only other possible way of settling the dispute is through a Boundary Commission or by arbitration by a third party. That is all we could do. But, to say that we would consider this question in a leisurely way later on when the general pattern of reorganization is known and with reference to the various other boundary disputes which might arise later on we shall leisurely consider this question also as a uniform principle, will, I am afraid, only create difficulties not only for the Andhra Government, but also for the Madras Government and more than all others for the people living in those areas. My respectful submission to the House is that the Government are aware of the miscalculation that they made and they do realize it. At the same time, I wish to tell hon. Members that we are taking steps to see that a Boundary Commission is appointed forthwith. We have already addressed the Government of India who are seized of the matter. I hope and trust that the Government of India would realize the necessity to appoint a Boundary Commission immediately, forthwith I should say for the purpose of solving this sufficiently longstanding dispute.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM : Sir, I rise on a point of information. While piloting the State Reorganization Bill in the Parliament, the Union Home Minister has made a statement that no Boundary Commission would be appointed to settle border disputes and that all border disputes would be referred to Zonal Councils only. I suppose that he was referring to other border disputes that would arise hereafter after the reorganization of the States and not to disputes which had arisen long, long ago. Have the Government of Madras made the position clear to the Government of India and

13th August 1956]

[Sri K. Vinayakam]

particularly to the Home Minister, Sri Pant, that his remarks about the reference of border disputes to Zonal Councils referred only to disputes that might arise hereafter and not to those which already existed and if so, what was the reply given by the Government of India? I would like to have a reply from the Hon. Minister on this specific point.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, the position is clear in any event. The Union Home Minister was dealing with the States Reorganization Bill and problems arising out of the proposed reorganization and nothing else. But, the disputes relating to the Madras-Andhra border have arisen long, long ago, long before the appointment of the Reorganization Commission itself. Even in the report of this Commission, mention is made about this problem. So, it is clear that it should be settled otherwise. It cannot be conceived that the Union Home Minister was referring to the boundary disputes which had arisen as a result of the formation of the Andhra State. This is completely a separate problem. It is not covered by the States Reorganization Commission's Report or the Bill which the Parliament considered. It is covered by the statement of the Prime Minister and the Home Minister with reference to this dispute and it has been made quite clear in the communication that these two problems could not be mixed up and that they should be separately dealt with. We are hoping that ere long, a Boundary Commission will be appointed and this problem will be settled once and for all to the satisfaction of everybody.

Sir, having said that much, I now come to the problems which had arisen out of the present proposal for reorganization of other States. Some of these problems had been referred to by many of the hon. Members. I was particularly pained to hear Members from Malabar referring to allegations made regarding the cutting of trees and the movement of certain machinery and articles from Malabar to the Tamil area. Not only they were making reference to it, but from the way they spoke, it looked as though they sincerely believed those allegations. It is most unfortunate. I may tell the hon. Members that when this question of interim administration till the reorganization took effect so far as Malabar and South Kanara were concerned, came up for consideration—not after the allegations were made—the Government came to the conclusion that every normal activity should go on and not only every normal activity, but every developmental activity contemplated under the Plan should go on uninterrupted in Malabar and South Kanara. I may assure the hon. Members coming from Malabar—no such assurance is necessary in the case of hon. Members coming from South Kanara as they have themselves admitted it and they know it for certain—that no scheme has been held up because of the proposed reorganization. On the other hand, hon. Members may be aware that we have expedited the Meenakari Project. It was not on the schedule to be started in the beginning of this year. But we thought that it should be started immediately so that it can go

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [13th August 1956]

on even after partition as otherwise if it should be left for being taken up for execution after the reorganization of States, it might take an unduly long time. In the same manner, with reference to the various other projects, we have taken the same attitude. In spite of that, various allegations have been made by responsible Members of Legislature and Members of Parliament that we are showing a partial attitude, a discriminatory attitude. Responsible newspapers have also come out with editorials making charges against the Madras Government that they were dropping many of the Plan proposals. To give instances where they were deliberately false, I would mention a few of them for the benefit of hon. Members of this House. An allegation was made in the editorial of a leading Daily that it was proposed to start an industrial school at Cannanore and for that purpose orders were placed for furniture in the Kozhikode Polytechnic Institute. It was further alleged in that editorial that we had subsequently dropped that proposal to start the industrial school at Cannanore and not only that, we had taken away the furniture intended for that school to some other school in the Tamil area.

11.50
a.m.

I was also taken aback when this was brought to my notice and I asked for a detailed note from the Director of Industries and Commerce. He was also taken aback by this allegation. Sir, at the time when this allegation was made in that editorial, negotiations were going on for the purpose of fixing up a building there. As a matter of fact, long before that, one building was fixed up but later on it was found that that building was not available. Therefore, negotiations were going on for the fixing up of another building. Not only that. It had been ordered that advertisements should be issued in the various newspapers calling for applications from students. They had fixed up the date for the starting of that school and I wanted to know why the allegation of removal of furniture was made and whether there was any truth in that allegation. The facts are these: We have developed a polytechnic in Kozhikode as a main centre for carpentry and therefore we have been placing orders for our requirements of furniture with this polytechnic institute for the various institutions located in the Tamil area. I am sure, hon. Members will welcome it to the extent that it gives employment to people in Malabar. On the same basis, orders were placed for the furniture requirements of the Cannanore school and two other schools with this Institute. No doubt, the furniture intended for the other two schools were removed—if I may mention that word—from Kozhikode. But the furniture intended for Cannanore was removed to Cannanore only and the school has started functioning. This is one of the glaring instances of wild allegations. So also I would refer to the removal of other properties. A Member of Parliament made an allegation in a letter written to the Union Education Minister, Sri Maulana Azad, and the Union Home Minister, Shri Pant, that the Government of Madras are intending to remove the printing machinery located in the Cannanore Jail and also other machinery which have been used for rope-making

13th August 1956] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

and other things. A copy of that letter was sent to me. Immediately I asked for details about it. I got back this startling detail, saying that there was no press machinery at all located in the Cannanore Jail. As far as the other items of machinery are concerned, there was absolutely no proposal to remove them anywhere. That being so, such an allegation was made. And then later on came another startling announcement in one of the newspapers, saying: 'No doubt, they have not been removed now but if they had not made that allegation, they would have been removed'. It is really something about which I do not think that we should feel ourselves proud at any time and instead of making amends for those false allegations, they had stated that if they had not made that announcement in the newspapers, we would have removed all the articles from there.

Then, Sir, another allegation was made with regard to the removal of fishing boats. I am sure hon. Members are aware—particularly hon. Members coming from Malabar—that during the monsoon season these boats cannot be used for fishing purposes on the West Coast. But when I was in South Kanara at the beginning of the monsoon season, a few individuals approached me and told me: 'Here are some of the fishing boats which are being removed to the East Coast and pending partition this should not be done'. Then I found, after referring the matter to the department concerned that this movement was normal as during the monsoon season when these boats could not be used in the West Coast, they could be removed to the East Coast. This was done as a normal routine work. Hon. Members should know that it is not as if these boats were partitioned according to their location at the time of partition. If they had looked into the history of the formation of the Andhra State, they would have found that the fishing boats were divided on the basis of their use in the various areas with reference to the fishing requirements in the areas. Therefore, by merely removing all fishing boats from the West Coast to the East Coast, we cannot certainly say that these boats are located on the East Coast and therefore they cannot have any division in the assets as far as these boats are concerned. It will be absurd to put forward such a plea with regard to the division of these fishing boats.

Sir, reference has also been made to the movement of some elephants. The Forest Department have got a fleet of elephants for the purpose of removing timber from the forest areas and they also move from one area to another area according to the requirements of the situation and particularly the elephants which were moving belonged to a camp in the Coimbatore district. They were removed to the Wynaad area because there was more urgent work to be done. After the completion of that work, they had to be removed to that Tamil area because work had to be done in that area and that movement was taken to mean that the Government were moving all the elephants so that Malabar might be deprived of them. Sir, I am sure that Malabar is rich in elephants and I do

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[13th August 1956]

not think that by taking a few elephants they would be deprived of them nor would we be able to have all the prosperity because of these elephants.

Then, I would refer to the cutting of the trees because that has created some confusion in the minds of some responsible hon. Members of this House. It was pointed out that an office-bearer of the Congress Organization had given some statement with reference to the felling of the trees. The point for consideration is this. There are two aspects of the matter to be taken into consideration. One aspect of the matter had already been referred to by my colleague, Sri Bhaktavatsalam with reference to the new formula of exploitation, that is, instead of adopting the formula of felling trees after leaving the thick trees, after 60 or 70 years, to adopt a shorter rotation of 30 years. I have also explained that in the Travancore-Cochin State, they are adopting the policy of rotation of 17 or 18 years. But we have adopted, the other policy of rotation of 30 years in 1954. Even though the officers were contemplating the cutting of trees on this basis, I may assure hon. Members that no steps had been taken for the purpose of implementing it. But telegrams rushed to Delhi and also to our Government, stating that crores of rupees worth of teakwood trees had been felled and immature trees were being felled and therefore it should be stopped. I saw the telegram. I was told that it was done on a new basis altogether. The first thing that I should do was to stop the felling of trees and there should be no felling at all. I asked the Chief Secretary to Government to issue a telegram instructing every officer to stop the felling of trees. I am mentioning this because the wording of this telegram was taken advantage of later on to show that we wanted to hide something. On the basis of the information given by an hon. Member of Parliament in his telegram that crores of rupees worth of trees were being cut, we issued instructions immediately without reference to any of the officers saying, "Stop felling of trees". Then we called for a report on the matter. But pending this report, the Government of India also took action on the representations made by this hon. Member on the same matter. They instructed the Deputy Inspector-General of Forests, who was here, in this State, in connexion with a conference held at Coimbatore, to inspect the spot and submit a report. He did inspect the spot with our officers and then he found not even a tree being felled under this new scheme. I shall come to the subject of felling the 90 trees a little later. Another startling announcement was made in the newspapers how the Finance Minister came to know about the report of the Deputy Inspector-General of Forests even before he submitted it and whether the latter did have any consultations with the former. I may tell the hon. Members and those who are interested in the matter that it is not only the Deputy Inspector-General of Forests who visited the forest area but our Forest Officers also visited the area and they have sent a report to us on the matter. It was stated in that report that no tree was felled. The Deputy Inspector-General of Forests also saw me later on and told me that not even a single tree was felled under the new

12
noon.

13th August 1956] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

scheme. That being so, representations were made that immature trees worth crores of rupees were being felled so that Malabar district might be deprived of . . .

SRI M. PALANIYANDI : சார், தயவுசெய்து அந்த பார்லிமெண்டு மெம்பர் பெயரைச் சொன்னால் சௌகரியமாக இருக்குமென்று நினைக்கிறேன்.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I do not think, it is necessary to give names. Names are unimportant. One Member is as important as another Member. The point is that this was made by a Member of Parliament and so, we have to attach some importance.

SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI : To which party the Member of the Parliament belongs?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : The Communist Party, if I may say so. The point for consideration is this. I can even now categorically say that not even one tree was cut under this new policy. But what about the routine operations which have to go every year in the forests? Because we have got a phased programme of clearing the forests and then planting in that area with new plantations, do the hon. Members want us to stop all normal activities also in these forest areas? Simply because these forests are in Malabar area and that normal routine work should not go on there in view of the impending partition, then will not other hon. Members from Tamilnad be entitled to say that if normal work should also be stopped—namely, that felling of trees and removing them to the usual base should be stopped—then other normal activities should also be automatically stopped as it cannot be one-way traffic. It might be said by them that all investments also might be stopped. The trees which have been felled in the usual routine way may give us a few lakhs of rupees. But it is nothing compared with the investments that we are making in Malabar. I am sure no hon. Member would be a party to such a suggestion even though papers may agitate for it, the public may agitate about it. If any hon. Member has seen any cutting of trees, if Mr. Unni has seen any cutting of trees it is only cutting of trees in the normal area of operation and it has nothing to do with the new policy which we have adumbrated in the year 1954. If that be so, I would like to know why all these charges before the Government of India and in the Press and why all these things were resorted to.

Mention was made about a glass house. Hon. Members would be interested to know about it. The so-called glass bungalow or house costs Rs. 2,500. It is just like a tent, a movable hut if I may say so. This house is erected at places where the officers carry on operations. As soon as the operations are over, the glass house is removed to another area. This house is used for housing the Ranger or other officers who want to occupy it. Is the Madras Government going to enrich itself by removing this glass house costing about Rs. 2,500 clandestinely so that the Malabar people may be impoverished? There must be some sense of proportion in

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[13th August 1956]

making statements. When crores of rupees of investment is involved, when we are pouring into Malabar district lakhs and lakhs of rupees in implementing the various programmes we have taken up, allegations that we are cutting a few trees here, that we are removing some machinery here or that we are removing this glass house from one place to another, have been made in an irresponsible manner, if I may say so and by persons who do not really realise the implications of these allegations. I think these were made by some people who want to pose themselves as the champions of the interests of Malabar. It did not stop with the persons belonging to the various parties alone. For the purpose of impressing upon the people that only particular parties can safeguard the interests of Malabar, there was a race between the parties—the Communist Party, the Congress Party, the Praja Socialist Party and I am saying this without making any distinction whatsoever—to impress upon the people of Malabar that they were the guardians of their interests. (An hon. Member : What about the Muslim League Party?)—Muslim League Party also. Apart from the political parties there was a race between everybody who went before the public and told them that they were safeguarding the interests of the public also.

SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAYAR : I am afraid the Hon. Minister is also led away in this. He will not be able to show any Congressman making these allegations. He is also carried away by emotion created by perhaps the Opposition.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : If I am wrong I am prepared to withdraw this allegation. If the hon. Member is prepared to prove his statement, I appreciate it. But there is nothing wrong in Congressmen making such a statement, for after all Congressmen are also human beings. When one particular party—the Communist Party—is in the race and wants to prove to the people that the Communist Party alone can safeguard the interests of the people and when the Praja Socialist Party enters the race, naturally the Congress Party also took it up. If it did not happen all courage to the Congressmen of Malabar. They are above human failings.

SRI T. C. NARAYANAN NAMBIAR : I did not understand the stand taken by the hon. Member Sri K. P. Kuttikrishnan Nair, when Sri P. Vasu Menon, President of Malayalam Pradesh Congress Committee has also issued a statement categorically stating that such things have taken place.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I am not concerned with individuals. This is the general atmosphere created there and we need not blame any particular individual or any particular party. It did not stop with political parties. Some of the petty officials also wanted to impress upon the political leaders that they were safeguarding the interests of Malabar and I have absolutely no doubt that some petty officials are responsible for carrying on false tales to some of these party leaders. But all that has arisen because of the atmosphere prevailing there. Therefore I am really happy

13th August 1956]

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

that the Leader of the Opposition appealed not only to me but to the people and to the House that we should restore the atmosphere of mutual confidence. After all if we separate to-day it does not mean that we will have nothing to do with each other in the future. As far as I am concerned, hon. Members are aware that I am convinced that though we would separate as good friends now, if not in the near future, at least in the foreseeable future we would unite and I have got faith in that. Apart from that there should not be mutual suspicion between the various peoples in departing. It is necessary to create an atmosphere of goodwill and confidence. If some Members are interested that this fusion should not take place at any time then of course they are interested in creating further difficulties and in increasing the misunderstandings between the two. I do not know whether this idea of fusion of Kerala and Madras at any distant future should not take place is at the back of their minds.

But, apart from that, whether we live as two separate entities 12-10 or whether we combine later on for our mutual advantage, we have P.M. to live as good friends and we have to co-operate with each other. Without that co-operation, I have absolutely no doubt that we cannot have prosperity and we cannot have sufficient development. Therefore, it is necessary to remove all this bad blood, which has been created, if I may say so, by false propaganda and by the mistaken publicity given to these various allegations. After all, if some hon. Member is really convinced that something wrong has been done, it is his duty, before writing about it to the press, to bring it to the notice of the Government and know from the Government what is going on. But what is happening is that hon. Members immediately rush to the press and give publicity and then write to the Government or complain about it to the Government of India. That further strengthens my argument that it is a race between political parties to impress upon the people that they are safeguarding the interests of the people. If they are really interested in safeguarding the interests of the people, then the first thing they ought to have done is to write to the various Governments and find out what is really going on and whether there is any truth in these allegations. I therefore appeal to the hon. Members belonging to the various regions to forget all these misgivings so that an atmosphere of mutual understanding and goodwill could be created. That is what we want and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition suggested that I could convene an informal meeting of the Members belonging to Malabar and an informal meeting of the Members belonging to South Kanara, or, if necessary, a meeting of both together. I am prepared to answer any charge made by any hon. Member and if I find that anything wrong has been done by anybody intentionally or even unintentionally, those wrongs will be rectified. I give this assurance. Therefore, I once again appeal not only to the representatives coming from Malabar but also to the people of Malabar not to be carried away by these false allegations and false propaganda. I am sure they would realize that so far as the Madras Government are concerned, they have tried to be

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[13th August 1956]

their friends and have tried to see that all the Plan proposals are implemented and they want to hand over a Malabar which would not be a liability to the Travancore-Cochin State, but, which, on the other hand, would benefit that State. I therefore hope that hon. Members will work for that atmosphere of goodwill and understanding at least in future and that the press also will give publicity to the activities of the hon. Members for the purpose of seeing that this bitter atmosphere, which has been created, is removed and a better atmosphere is created in its stead. Therefore, so far as that question is concerned, I can claim to know what is going on in the various administrative departments and knowing that, I can say I have a clear conscience in the matter. The Government have a clear conscience in the matter. They have not done anything which is likely to injure Malabar or South Kanara and the people of those areas may rest assured that, even though Malabar may not have any representative in the Ministry, for that very fact we have tried to be more generous to Malabar, if only they would know the various steps we have taken. I am sure those hon. Members who would have occasion to look into the files later on when they get into the administrative saddle of the new State of Kerala will realize that the Madras Government were more than a friend to the people of Malabar and to the people of South Kanara.

SRI T. ANANTA PAI : Sir, could not the Government think of taking more positive steps in this direction? After all, one should not be suspicious. This is not going to improve matters as things stand. I know also that this suspicion creeps into the official circles. Not only petty officials but even officers placed in high circles seem to have a narrow view of things. In view of this, will it not be possible for the Government to consult the Members coming from South Kanara and Malabar from time to time? It is not a question of trying to satisfy us or trying to show the *bona fides* of the Government. We have never questioned that, but fuller information may be given to us so that we in our turn may be in a position to place it before the public.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, I am always prepared to place all the information available with me before the hon. Members and that is why I accept the suggestion made by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. If we want to have an informal meeting of the Members of the two regions, I am prepared to have it and place before them whatever information they ask for.

DR. K. B. MENON : I believe that a more positive suggestion was made by many of the Members and will the Government consider accepting that suggestion of associating Malabar and South Kanara in the Partition Council or in some other positive way?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : It is not as if that is out of my mind. We have considered the suggestion of setting up a Partition Council of non-officials, but there are some practical difficulties in view of the situation prevailing in the Travancore-Cochin State and that is why we could not agree to that suggestion.

13th August 1956] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

Even a Partition Council will be only an informal body being associated with the various matters but now I have agreed to the suggestion that all the hon. Members belonging to those regions may meet and we may have an informal discussion about the various matters. There is no use of particular individuals being associated, but all the representatives belonging to those regions will have an opportunity to know what is happening and perhaps that will create a much better atmosphere rather than having a small number of people associated in a Committee.

SRI K. P. KUTTIKRISHNAN NAIR : Sir, may I request the Hon. Minister to say something about the allegation that something was done in the Travancore-Cochin State? I remember to have read some remarks that the Hon. the Finance Minister told something in connection with that. That doubt may also be dispelled now.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I mentioned that and said that I do not believe these things. That is why I mentioned that fact just to show that the allegations are not one-sided. There are allegations on both sides. As far as I am concerned, I have complete trust in the Travancore-Cochin State Government and even if something wrong should happen, I do not mind it, because we are not going to be impoverished simply because of the fact that some machinery is being removed. I am prepared to believe that nothing will be done by the Travancore-Cochin State Government. Unless we have that mutual confidence in each other, it will not be possible for us to carry on and I am not going to enter into a controversy with regard to that and ask for assurances from the Travancore-Cochin State Government or for an enquiry into that matter. Without any of these things, I am prepared to take that they are doing everything possible to the areas to be transferred to Madras and that nothing wrong is being done there.

Then, there was reference to the rise in prices. That is a great concern to the Government also, particularly because, as has been pointed out by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition himself, the very success of the Plan depends upon the maintenance of the prices at a certain level. Any unusual increase in the price level will upset the entire Plan frame and therefore, what is the remedy for this is the thing we have to consider. Of course, I am not surprised when the Leader of the Opposition says that the big stick should be used. Not that I feel that the big stick should not be used. If necessary, the big stick will be used. But I believe that before doing that, all the other steps should be taken and if we find that we are not successful, then more drastic measures will have to be taken.

With reference to hoarding, the hon. Leader of the Opposition asked why he did not take over the stocks. It is not as if we are unaware of the powers which we have or which we could have if only we want them. But we thought such an atmosphere need not be created, particularly when sufficient rice-stocks are available with the Government of India. We just want to find out whether the rise in price cannot be arrested by the usual operation of opening fair

12-20
p.m.

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [13th August 1956]

price shops. In that connection, criticism was made to the effect that fair price shops were restricted to urban centres and that they should be opened in rural areas also. After all, this is not a scheme for supplying rice to people of all the areas. We are interested in seeing that the price is brought down by strategic action. It is not necessary to open fair price shops in every place. After all, the major centres of consumption and where people have got money to pay a higher price for rice are urban centres. Therefore first of all we should stabilise the price in the urban areas. The scheme is not confined to urban areas; it percolates in the rural areas also. If we open fair price shops in urban areas, the more vulnerable areas, and stabilise the price there, it will have a healthy reaction in the rural areas. We have taken that action. Hon. Members are aware that fair price shops have been opened wherever we have found them necessary. The Collectors and the Commissioner of Civil Supplies have been given authority to open fair price shops wherever they think such shops are necessary even without reference to Government. Expeditionary action is being taken. It is not as if the steps taken by the Government have had no effect at all. If only hon. Members look into the newspaper reports to which the hon. Leader of the Opposition also was making reference, they will find that there is a tendency for the price to fall and there has been a fall in most of the areas. Particularly in Malabar, a bag of rice was selling at Rs. 43-8-0; the price has now come down to Rs. 37-8-0 or Rs. 38. Therefore it is not as if the steps taken by us have been ineffective. On the other hand, prices have been brought down. The main cause for rise in price even in Tanjore, which is a rice-producing area, is the unusual demand from Travancore-Cochin State and Malabar. Many merchants belonging to Malabar and Travancore-Cochin State were operating there. Andhra merchants also were operating in that area. They wanted to purchase here and pass on the stock to Malabar and Travancore-Cochin and make some money. In Malabar district, we have arrested the rise in price to a certain extent. But I do admit that it has not come down to the extent we would like it to come down. With the coming harvest, we are hoping that it will be possible to arrest the increase in price. But we have to take note of this unhealthy sign of increase in price due particularly to hoarding and the unsocial activities of persons who want to make huge and unjustifiable profits taking advantage of the conditions prevailing in the country. Government are aware of that problem and we are hoping that it will be possible to solve it without using the big stick. But I may give this assurance to the hon. Members and the people. If ultimately it becomes necessary, we will not only not hesitate to use the big stick, but we will use it with deadly effect. Then the hoarders will find that it will not pay anybody to play with the lives of the people, to play with the economy of the country, which act is likely to have an adverse effect on the implementation of the Plan. I am sure the unsocial elements will take note of the intentions of the Government. They also are our brethren; we hope that they also are interested in the progress of our country and that they will behave in the proper manner.

13th August 1956]

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

If anybody does not behave properly, then I do agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition that steps will have to be taken to eliminate those elements and teach them the lesson that it will not pay anybody to hoard particularly foodgrains. The sale of an essential articles like rice at a higher price is detrimental to the interests of the poorer sections of the people. The hon. Leader of the Opposition need not be under the impression that we are afraid of those elements or that we have any partiality for them. We want not only to implement the various development programmes in the Plan; we want also to achieve the higher objective of removing the differences between the various sectors of society and establish a socialistic pattern of society as early as possible. Towards the achievement of that objective, we will take all measures necessary. But some people believe in certain methods. But we believe in certain other method. We believe in persuasion and we try to bring round people to our view by persuasion. If we find that we are unable to convert them by persuasion, the Government will have to invoke all the powers available to them and take positive measures to convert them and make them realise that they should not resort to unsocial methods.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI: In view of the fact that a large number of people are affected whose welfare is of paramount importance, will the Government at least fix a time-limit of fifteen or twenty days or a month within which those people who have got stocks should release them at a particular price and say that if they do not release the stocks within that time, the Government will seize them and sell the rice at that price? Let the Government be prepared to attempt at least that much.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: I am thankful to the hon. Leader of the Opposition for making this very useful suggestion. Certainly I shall consider that also.

When we take note of this dangerous symptom of increase in price, we should try to find out the root cause of it. If it will be impossible to carry out the Plan programme in a period of rising prices, then we have to find out what cause led to the increase in price. After all, the remedy suggested by the hon. Leader of the Opposition of giving more emoluments to those in whom we are interested cannot certainly be a solution to the problem of increase in price. On the other hand, it will have a very deleterious effect. Making available to the people more money will not solve the problem; it will only push up the price. That is the law of inflation. Therefore what we should be interested in seeing is that sufficient quantities of rice are produced and that those quantities are properly distributed. If to-day there is a tendency for the price of foodgrains to rise, it is because of the availability of adequate quantities for the purpose of feeding the millions of our people. When there is a small increase in production, we find the prices are going down, and when there is a small decrease in production due to the vagaries of the monsoon, there is an increase in price and unsocial elements take advantage of that situation and try to increase the prices.

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[13th August 1956]

12-30
p.m.

Last year, the hon. Members on the other side were complaining that the agriculturists were incurring losses and were appealing to the Government to take steps to stabilise the agricultural prices at a higher level. The ultimate remedy to the increase in price is that there should be sufficient agricultural production to meet the needs of the country. After considering the entire Plan frame and the programme of action, the Planning Commission came to the correct conclusion that there was no use of planning for a 15 or 18 per cent increase in agricultural production and that they should have the target of a 40 per cent increase. In that way alone, we can solve the problem of deficit financing. Deficit financing will lead to inflationary trends. Therefore we have to keep in mind that agricultural production is to be stepped up. It is in that context we have to see the various steps which the Government are taking. Opening of seed farms, distribution of manures, making available to ryots cheap credit facilities, all these are steps taken by the Government for the purpose of seeing that particularly the ordinary ryot—not only the rich ryot—is in a position to step up production.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I may be given fifteen more minutes within which time I shall finish.

MR. SPEAKER : The House will sit till the Hon. Minister finishes his reply and the motion is voted upon.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Therefore it is necessary to see that we step up agricultural production. For that purpose, we are taking necessary steps. All the Agriculture Ministers from India are meeting on the 10th September to confer and take decisions in regard to the various steps which we have to take for the purpose of stepping up production.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : I am not now going into the question of the theory of inflation. While certainly it is necessary that production must be stepped up, we must note at the same time that the question of distribution is dependent upon the price mechanism. After all money serves the purpose of distributing the total national wealth created. This is a particular weapon. In order that this weapon is properly wielded, the price mechanism assumes importance even while production is stepped up or even at the existing level of production. In view of this, will the Government realise that the question of price is basically linked with the entire structure of economic development and therefore take note of it?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I do agree. The price mechanism will depend upon complete control. But then there are the consequences of control. If it is a question of controlling the entire price structure, we should introduce control. We have had our control. There should be no half-hearted control measures. These will lead to greater difficulties. Either we should have entire control or no control at all and try to stabilise prices by other measures. Once we decide upon control, then that control should be a complete control at every point. Leaving it in a state of flux at

13th August 1956]

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

certain points will give room to unsocial elements to play havoc. Such complete control will not be possible. That is the decision we have arrived at. We have to think of other measures for the purpose of controlling prices and those measures are being taken.

Incidentally the hon. the Leader of the Opposition referred to the cloth problem. That is a very vexed question. The policy of the Government of India, which has been recently announced, is under the examination of this Government as to how far it would affect the existing handloom weavers and how far that should be modified. But I am sure there will be a discussion on this aspect when the handloom question is discussed. I want to give this assurance to the House, not only to the House but to the lakhs of weavers living in our State, that it is the declared policy of this Government to see that sufficient protection is given to the handloom industry and that nothing is done which will in any way put this industry in jeopardy once again. Therefore if we ultimately agree to any programme of powerloom, it will be only after satisfying ourselves that it would not in any way affect the existing handloom industry. If we find after examination that this powerloom is likely to affect the handloom industry, I may assure hon. Members that we will not be a party to the introduction of the powerloom. If at all these powerlooms should be used as an experiment for the purpose of increasing production, then it should be done within the co-operative sector so that whatever is the increase in production and income, that should be available to all the persons belonging to that co-operative sector. That is the suggestion we have made. Even for the purposes of experiment if these powerlooms are introduced, and at a later stage they are found to affect the handloom industry, I give this assurance on behalf of the Government that we would not hesitate to scrap all these powerlooms even though crores of rupees might have been invested on them. I hope that such a situation would not arise of experimenting on such things and incurring losses. It is the declared policy of the Government that we should not allow the handloom industry to suffer in any way. We will take all steps to see that the handloom industry is properly protected and sufficient guarantees and safeguards are given to it in any measure undertaken by the Government. I may inform hon. Members that we are not committed to anything. The proposal is still under the examination of the Government of Madras. We are examining how far this powerloom programme is likely to affect the handloom industry. That is why I put this before the Conference (to which the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition made reference) of the Co-operative Weavers' Societies. I told them, 'These are the proposals made by the Government of India; we have to consider whether these proposals are likely to affect the handloom industry; we have to consider them from the various aspects; and we have to make various suggestions'. Therefore, hon. Members should not be under the impression, particularly after we have passed unanimously a resolution for the protection of handloom weavers, that the Government of Madras will be a party to any step which will put the

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[13th August 1956]

handloom industry again in difficulties. To this extent we stand committed. If at any time, we find that we are unable to give effect to our assurances, you may find that somebody else will be here for the purpose of carrying on the Government. I may give this assurance to the House.

Apart from the two items of handloom and agricultural production, the general picture in regard to the industrial development of the State is becoming clearer now. I am sure hon. Members would have read with great interest the success of the tests carried on in Neiveli. In addition to this, the other day some news item appeared regarding the location of the Aluminium Plant. There would be the private sector in addition to this. For example, there will be paper manufacturing units and rayon manufacturing units. These are all under discussion. I am sure that when we know the entire picture of industrial development for the Second Five-Year Plan, we may derive some sense of satisfaction, even though it may not be complete satisfaction, that we are not neglected completely. Our demands have been taken note of, and something has been achieved by the demands we were making all along before the National Development Council. All this depends upon how we function here as Government and as legislators. We have got only limited resources which should be used to the best advantage. If there should be waste at any point, to that extent we would be failing in our duty. Therefore, it should be the endeavour of this Assembly, as the custodian of the interests of the entire State, to see that waste is avoided at all points. I may assure hon. Members of this House that it will be the endeavour of this Government to see that waste is avoided to the best of our ability. If we want to see that we have a bigger programme of planned expenditure on more schemes so that the planned programme may be further extended, then that will depend entirely upon the resources we may be able to mobilise. As far as revenue expenditure is concerned, it should be the duty of any Government—whoever be the Finance Minister of that Government—to see that at least for a period of time, say, four or five years, the revenue budget is balanced. Certainly it would not be good financial policy to incur revenue expenditure on borrowed capital. That will be the wrong way of doing things. I hope no Finance Minister will resort to meeting revenue expenditure from capital borrowed in the open market. Many suggestions have been made by hon. Members. One suggestion was, 'Why not we resort to borrowing to meet our minimum demands on the revenue side?' That suggestion, I am afraid, I am unable to accept. We will have to depend upon revenue resources to meet revenue expenditure. That will have to be kept in mind. Our expenditure includes not only capital expenditure but also revenue expenditure. Taking into account what would be available on the revenue side resources and what would be the resources available on the capital side from the borrowings, our loan programmes and other saving programmes, we have fixed our target in the Plan. Instead of incurring expenditure as provided

12th August 1956]

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

for in the Plan, if we are to incur some other extra expenditure in whatever field it may be—either by way of increased pay or increased dearness allowance or whatever it is—ultimately, we have to resort to the cutting down of some items in the Plan to that extent. After all, we have taken into account the entire resources available to us and we have framed our Plan for the State and for the country as a whole. So, if the hon. Members should feel that something else should get higher priority, a priority higher than that given to some of the schemes found in the Plan framed by us, then certainly we have to cut down some of the items from the Plan. That is inevitable whoever may be the Finance Minister or whoever be in charge of the Government. Therefore, we will have to take into account all these matters. The problem is not so easy as to say, "Let us take only a particular aspect of the matter and let us try to meet it." If such a view is taken, we will be finding ourselves in difficulties later on when we consider other problems. So, in this atmosphere of planned development and planned expenditure, we cannot be tinkering with one portion of it alone leaving the other unaffected. That will necessarily affect the other parts of the Plan itself. I request the hon. Members to keep all these aspects in mind. In that connection, the loan which we are floating becomes a little important. Because, that will exhibit or rather demonstrate to the Planning Commission and the Government of India that as far as the people of Madras are concerned, they are prepared to make sufficient resources available for the implementation of the various programmes outlined in the Plan and which we have chalked out. Even last year, when we wanted only Rs. 7 crores, in two days, a sum of Rs. 14½ crores was subscribed. For the present loan, we have fixed Rs. 12½ crores as our target. This is an unprecedented sum as far as any State loan is concerned at any time. We have absolute faith in our people—not in the big people, because hon. Members know that we were getting our loans subscribed not by bigger people, but by ordinary middle-class families, from ryots and from ordinary merchants in the rural areas particularly. I hope this time also, the people would not fail us. Because, all the Rs. 12½ crores will be spent not in wasteful expenditure but will be spent for the purpose of taking up schemes which would build the economy of our State, which would strengthen our economy, which would lead us on to prosperity, further prosperity so that it may be possible for us to say that we have reached a stage wherein everybody will have three square meals a day, sufficient cloth to clothe themselves, good, healthy dwellings to live, adequate educational and medical facilities. After all, that will be the socialistic pattern of society which will meet the essential needs of all human-beings. That pattern of society in which the essential needs of the common man will be adequately met could be built up only through a laborious task by savings and by sacrifices which we are called upon to do. In that task, I hope every hon. Member will contribute his mite to see that not only the proposed loan becomes a success but also the various schemes that we propose to take up and for which the loan is intended become a success so that an

[Sri G. Subramaniam] [13th August 1956]

era of prosperity is ushered in as early as possible and so that the persons who are now suffering may be relieved of their suffering. After all, it is not the rich people who are suffering. If we want immediate development and rapid development, it is in the interests of these poor people who are now suffering a great deal and it is very necessary that their essential needs must be met. In this respect, I am sure the Government would have the co-operation of all the Members of the Legislature and the people of this State. Thank you, Sir.

SRI A. RATNAM: Sir, I press clause (a) of my amendment and withdraw the rest.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is—

“Add at the end the following:—

‘but regret to note that the Governor has not been properly advised by his Council of Ministers in regard to taking effective steps on—

the failure to mention the grievances of N.G.Os., the relief to be given to them and the action taken to redress their grievances.’”

12-50 p.m. The amendment was put and the House divided thus—

Ayes—37.

Sri K. Kunhi Mohamed Shafee.
 „ **S. Swayamprakasam.**
 „ **S. C. C. Anthony Pillai.**
 „ **K. Vinayakam.**
 „ **A. Ratnam.**
 „ **P. Rangasamy Reddiar.**
 „ **A. Govindaswamy Nayagar.**
 „ **S. P. Thangavelu.**
 „ **M. Kandaswami Kandar.**
 „ **A. Veloo.**
 „ **K. S. Lakshmiipathi Naicker.**
 „ **R. Rangaswami Gounder.**
Dr. K. B. Menon.
Sri K. T. Sridharan.
 „ **C. Kunhirama Kurup.**
 „ **M. Narayanan Nambiar.**
 „ **S. Pakkiriswami Pillai.**
 „ **P. Kunhirama Kidav.**
 „ **K. Moidu.**

Sri P. Ramamurthi.
 „ **M. Kalyanasundaram.**
 „ **K. P. Gopalan.**
 „ **T. C. Narayanan Nambiar.**
 „ **C. Kandasamy.**
 „ **K. T. Raju.**
 „ **S. Ramalingam.**
 „ **S. Valivelu.**
 „ **K. C. Gopalan Unni.**
 „ **P. K. Gopalakrishnan.**
 „ **A. K. Subbiah.**
 „ **K. V. Ramaswami.**
 „ **T. S. Ardhanari.**
 „ **P. Venkatesha Sholagar.**
 „ **K. Madhavan Nambiar.**
 „ **E. T. Kunhan.**
 „ **C. H. Kanaran.**
 „ **R. Krishnan.**

Noes—88.

The Hon. Sri C. Subramaniam.
Sri K. Rajaram Naidu.
 „ **B. Bhaktavatsalu Naidu.**
Raja Muthiah Chettiar of Chettinad.
Sri P. G. Karuthiruman.
 „ **V. C. Palaniswami Gounder.**
 „ **V. K. Palaniswami Gounder.**
 „ **N. Mahalingam.**
 „ **P. K. Thirumurthi.**
 „ **R. Kuppusami.**
 „ **S. R. Arumugam.**
 „ **S. S. Rangaswami Naidu.**
 „ **S. Lakshmana Kandar.**

Sri P. G. Manickam.
 „ **M. S. Selvarajan.**
 „ **R. Krishnaswamy Gopalar.**
 „ **K. Venkataswami Naidu.**
 „ **N. Ramakrishna Iyer.**
 „ **M. R. Ramachandran.**
 „ **V. K. Ramaswami Mudaliar.**
 „ **S. Panchaksharam.**
 „ **A. K. Masilamani Chettiar.**
 „ **R. Thangavelu.**
 „ **A. Ramachandra Reddiar.**
 „ **K. S. Ardhanaraswara Gounder.**
 „ **A. Sambasivam.**

18th August 1956]

Noes—cont.

Sri M. Dharmalingam.
 „ N. Paramasiva Udayar.
 The Hon. Sri S. S. Ramaswami
 Padayatchi.

Sri T. K. Rama.
 „ M. S. Muniswami Pillai.
 „ V. S. Chinnaswami Naidu.
 „ S. Chinnakaruppa Thevar.
 „ V. S. Sivaprakasam.
 „ A. Iyanar.
 „ V. Muthu.
 „ A. S. Subbaraj.
 „ S. Thinnakarawami Thevar.
 „ V. Chinnayya.
 „ N. Rajagopal.
 „ R. M. Palaniappan.
 „ A. M. Ratnaswami.
 „ T. R. Varadan.
 „ G. Muthiah Pillai.
 „ M. D. Thiagaraja Pillai.
 „ S. Arumugam Pillai.
 „ K. G. Palaniswami Gounder.
 „ V. Vairava Thevar.
 „ M. Marimuthu.
 „ Mohamed Saliah Marakayar.
 „ M. C. Muthukumaraswami.
 „ V. Krishnaswami Padayachi.
 „ A. S. Sahajananda.
 „ K. Parthasarathy.
 „ M. Jagannathan.
 „ P. S. Krishnaswami Ayyangar.
 „ G. Govindan.

Sri M. Kandaswami Padayachi.
 „ R. Krishnaswami Naidu.
 „ T. P. Elumalai.
 „ M. G. Shanker.
 „ T. Ganapathi.
 „ V. Venugopala Krishnaswamy.
 „ A. Vaikuntam.
 „ R. S. Arumugam.
 „ J. L. P. Roche Victoria.
 „ P. Selvaraj.
 „ M. Chinnathambi Thevar.
 „ K. Ramaswami Doss.
 „ I. K. Subramania Pillai.
 „ K. Venkataramana Gowda.
 „ K. Ishwara.
 „ B. Vaikunta Baliga.
 „ K. P. Kuttikrishnan Nair.
 „ T. Ananta Pai.
 „ K. H. Bomman.
 „ V. Dharmalinga Nayakar.
 „ G. Samia Koorayar.
 „ W. J. Fernandez.
 „ E. K. Sankara Varma Raja.
 „ K. Aranganathan.
 „ M. Venugopala Gounder.
 „ A. Appu.
 „ A. Muthuswami.
 „ M. Kattimuthu.
 „ T. Menavalan.
 „ K. R. Viswanathan.
 „ P. Ponnambela Gounder.

Neutral—Nil.

Ayes—37; Noes—88; Neutral—Nil.

The amendment was lost.

The amendments of Sri Ratnam 1 (b) to 1 (k) were by leave, withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is—

Add at the end the following:

“ but regret to note that no mention was made in the Address on the following problems:

(1) the flood havoc in Malabar and South Kanara in the last week of June and first week of July 1956 which caused great hardship, misery and distress and even loss of life to the people of South Kanara and Malabar;

(2) the destruction of 1,000 houses in Neelaswaram firka alone in South Kanara district, Kasargod taluk and destruction of about 500 houses in Malabar owing to flood and the miserable position of thousands of people becoming homeless and also loss of properties worth lakhs of rupees;

(3) the inadequate relief measures and compensation given to the victims of flood by the Government;

(4) no proper assessment was made in the Address regarding the serious food situation existing in the State especially in Malabar owing to the rise in price of rice and other essential

[Mr. Speaker]

[13th August 1956]

commodities by about 50 per cent and above and the failure of the Government to bring down the price level of the essential commodities including rice and to open adequate number of fair price shops in Malabar on the basis of village ward and factory;

(5) the failure of the Government to open fair price shops in the plantation estates of Malabar and other estates in the States for the benefit of thousands of estate workers whose conditions are peculiar and are not in a position to get rice at fair price within their reach;

(6) no mention was made in the Address regarding the measures which the Government failed to take on the following points regarding the workers and labourers in the State :—

(a) increase in the wages of the workers in the State by 25 per cent;

(b) fixation of minimum wages in many industries;

(c) bonus question of the workers in the State;

(d) non-recognition of trade unions and trade union rights by the employers;

(e) stopping of victimization, dismissals, retrenchments, closure of factories, non-implementation of awards, reduction of wages, etc., that is going on in the State;

(f) delay in publishing the enquiry report on beedi industry submitted to the Government by the Special Officer appointed by the Government and delay in bringing legislation on beedi industry;

(g) failure of the Government to exempt all applications, appeals and vakalats sent by workers in the industrial courts, etc., from affixing court-fee stamps for Rs. 2 as per the existing labour laws of the State, and

(h) non-fixation and revision of minimum wages to the workers under local bodies and municipalities, Highways, etc., and the failure of the Government to constitute committees or other machinery to enquire into their conditions and submit reports to Government as early as possible;

(7) the failure of the Government to introduce electricity in the Community Block area of Payyanur, North Malabar, and to other National Extension Scheme Blocks in Malabar even though money was allotted for introducing electricity in these development areas by Government;

(8) the failure of the Government to allot due share from the Handloom Cess Fund to Malabar for the benefit of handloom industry and handloom workers of Malabar;

(9) no mention was made in the Address regarding the miserable conditions of the N.G.Os. in the State and no proposal to take steps to ameliorate their conditions on the question of increase in salary, dearness allowance, service conditions, etc., on

13th August 1956] [Mr. Speaker]

a par with the conditions of the Central Government employees and in accordance with the recommendations of the Pay Commission;

(10) no mention was made in the Address regarding the failure of the Government to increase the salary, dearness allowance, service conditions, etc., of the village officers in the State;

(11) the failure of the Government to constitute an enquiry committee consisting of members of the Legislature from Tamil Nad and Malabar to enquire into the allegations made by responsible persons in Malabar regarding the removal of machinery and other movable properties from Malabar on the eve of the States Reorganization so as to remove apprehensions in the minds of the people and maintain good and cordial relationship between Tamil and Malayalee people; and

(12) release of political prisoners lodged in various jails and in the Central Jail, Cannanore, on the inauguration of the reorganization and formation of linguistic States."

The amendment was put and lost.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member, Sri Narayana Kurup, is not in his seat and therefore his amendment is deemed to have been withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is—

Add at the end the following:

"but regret that no mention was made in the Address on the following:

(1) failure of the Government to open fair-price shops in all villages in Malabar which is a highly deficit district;

(2) apprehension caused in the minds of the people on account of the transfer of machinery and other movables from Malabar on the eve of the Reorganization of the States;

(3) failure of the Government to comply with the reasonable demands made by the N.G.Os. of the State;

(4) failure of the Government to meet the grievances of the village officers in the State; and

(5) formation of a Kerala State Legislature consisting of Members of the Madras Legislature from Malabar district and Kasaragod taluk and Members of the dissolved Travancore-Cochin State Legislature from those areas which are to be part of the future Kerala State, after Reorganization of the States."

The amendment was put and lost.

[13th August 1956]

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

Add at the end the following :

“ but regret to note that no mention has been made to the damages caused by recent floods in Kasargod taluk and to the difficult food situation in Kasaragod taluk, South Kanara.”

The amendment was put and lost.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

Add at the end the following :

“ but regret to note that adequate attention has not been given in the Address to the consequences resulting from the Reorganization of States in relation to Malabar and South Kanara.”

The amendment was put and lost.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

Add at the end the following :

“ but regret to note that no mention has been made in the Address on the following :

(1) the measures the Government propose to take to relieve the hardship caused, by way of collecting water-cess forcibly with the aid of the police, to many of the ryots in Modakurichi firka in Erode taluk of Coimbatore district and other places in the Lower Bhavani Project Ayacut who have not been given the facility to use the water for lack of sluice facilities or other causes;

(2) the need to cancel the crop control now in force in Lower Bhavani Project Ayacut of about 2,07,000 acres which is very seriously affecting the ryots economically;

(3) the need to remove the penalty levied on the ryots who cultivated paddy utilizing the seepage water in the Lower Bhavani Project Ayacut area;

(4) the need to fix a fair price for commercial crops such as tobacco, groundnut, cotton, turmeric, etc.;

(5) the relief measures to be taken to wipe out rural indebtedness;

(6) the need to exempt from sales tax food articles and to levy sales tax at single point for all other commodities.”

The amendment was put and lost.

13th August 1956]

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

Add at the end the following :

“ but regret—

(a) that no mention is made of the future of the Members of Malabar district and of Kasargod taluk of South Kanara district of this House immediately after the Reorganization of the States;

(b) that no suggestions have been offered in order to avoid extension of President's Rule from the Travancore-Cochin State to Malabar district and to Kasargod taluk;

(c) that no suggestion has been made to associate the people of Malabar through their elected representatives in the division of assets and liabilities and other vital matters connected with the separation of Malabar from Madras State;

(d) that no mention has been made about the adequate and effective representation of the Muslims and other minority communities in the Legislatures, Local Bodies and Administrative Services; and

(e) that no protection has been suggested to afford relief to the Muslim community from the handicaps resulting from the enforcement of the provisions of the Madras Building Rules regarding the construction, extension and repairs of mosques, madrasahs and similar religious institutions.”

The amendment was put and lost.

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

Add at the end the following :

“ but regret to note that no mention has been made in the Address on the following :

(1) the proposals of the Government to enhance the salary and dearness allowance of the Non-Gazetted Officers in the State;

(2) the action to be taken to settle the border issue between the Andhra and Madras States;

(3) the action to be taken to bring down the level of prices of foodgrains in Tanjore district where the retail price of rice is annas fifteen per Madras measure;

(4) the action to be taken to solve rural unemployment;

(5) the need to start a medical college, an engineering college and an agricultural college at Tanjore;

(6) the action to be taken for setting up a steel plant in Salem where iron ore is available by using the lignite from Neiveli;

(7) the need to bring legislative measures to fix minimum wages to agricultural labourers;

(8) the need to bring legislative measures to ensure minimum living conditions and working conditions to beedi workers and hotel workers; and

[13th August 1956]

(9) the need to exempt from sales tax food materials and to levy sales tax at single point for all other commodities."

The amendment was put and lost.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is—

Add at the end the following:

"but regret to note that—

(1) the Address has failed to mention anything about complaints raised by certain responsible persons in Malabar regarding transfer of movables such as machines, elephants, etc., from Malabar in view of the impending Reorganization of the States;

(2) the Address has failed to recommend the formation of a popular Government and State Legislature for Kerala after the Reorganization of the States, consisting of elected members from Malabar district and Kasargod taluk in the present Madras Legislature and Members of the dissolved Travancore-Cochin Legislature from those areas which are to be the part of Kerala State;

(3) the Address has failed to mention anything about the recent flood and cyclone that worked havoc in the West Coast;

(4) the Address has failed to mention anything about the rise in prices of daily necessities of life other than rice and has also failed to point out the failure of the Government to open Fair Price Shops in all localities so as to bring down the price of rice;

(5) the Address has failed to mention anything about the fall in the price of pepper, jaggery, etc.;

(6) the Address has failed to recommend single point sales tax for all food articles;

(7) the Address has failed to mention anything about the grievances of the Non-Gazetted Officers in the State and the remedial measures;

(8) the Address has failed to mention anything about the grievances of Village Officers and the remedial measures;

(9) the Address has failed to mention anything about fixing minimum wages for agricultural labourers;

(10) the Address has failed to mention anything about the crisis that may arise in the employment situation on account of introduction of power-looms in the handloom sector;

(11) the Address has failed to mention anything about the condition of workers engaged in the Beedi Industry;

(12) the Address has failed to mention anything about implementing the recommendations of the Land Reform Panel of the Planning Commission; and

(13) the Address has failed to state anything about nationalization of private forests in Malabar."

The amendment was put and lost.

13th August 1956]

MR. SPEAKER: The question is—

Add at the end the following:

“ but regret to note—

(1) that the Governor was ill-advised by the Council of Ministers when it is stated in paragraph 2 of the Address that “ some of the predominantly Tamil speaking areas of Travancore-Cochin State will merge with this State ”; which will embitter the feelings of the people of the predominantly Malayalam-speaking areas of this State to be included in the proposed Kerala State;

(2) that the Address is unrealistic when it did not take into consideration the agitation of the Village Officers and failed to assure them that suitable measures will be taken to grant them at least the educational and medical concessions given to Non-Gazetted Officers and teachers pending final decisions as regards improving their conditions of service, etc.;

(3) that the Address has not mentioned about the step taken for granting an *Ad hoc* increase of at least 25 per cent in the emoluments of all Non-Gazetted staff under the State Government and also to appoint a Pay Commission to enquire and report on the need to revise their scales of pay, etc.;

(4) that the Address has not mentioned the measures the Government propose to take to remove the apprehension and anxiety among the Malayalees caused by the alleged cutting of trees, removal of live-stock including five elephants and valuable properties from Malabar;

(5) that the Address has not assured the minority sections of the people in the future Madras State, especially Malayalees that justice will be done to the minorities in matters of appointment, service, etc.;

(6) that the Address has not mentioned anything about the stand of this Government about the position of the M.L.As. from Malayalam-speaking areas to be merged in Kerala, till the next elections and as long as the present Madras Legislature continues;

(7) that the Address underestimated the situation when it stated that only the urban areas are vulnerable to the increase in the price of food articles and not the villages especially in Malabar where fair price shops should be opened in all villages;

(8) that the Address has ignored the sufferings of the large sections of people including Harijans especially on account of the recent heavy floods in Malabar district and Kasargod taluk of South Kanara district and did not mention what relief measures Government contemplate to adopt for them;

(9) that the Address has not mentioned about the fact that “ Malabar district split-up plans ” for the Second Five-Year Plan are not completed yet and not distributed among the M.L.As. from that area;

[Mr. Speaker] [13th August 1956]

(10) that the Address has not mentioned about—

(a) the regional disparity in the matter of selection of development schemes;

(b) the necessity to include Irikkoor Firka in the National Extension Scheme;

(c) the justness of the need to sanction more development schemes in Eranad taluk and Attappady area of the Walluvanad taluk;

(d) the sanction and allocation of rural health centres to Changalazi and Narath villages of Taliparamba block development area;

(e) the construction of a causeway to Ayappozha river in Irikkoor and the construction of bridges over Kattampalli and Pavannoor ferries of the Baliapattam river;

(f) the establishment of a High School in Eravasi village;

(g) organization of a dispensary at Payyanoor;

(h) extension of electricity to all the villages in the Taliparamba Block Development area from Pappinisseri; and

(i) the grant of 15 cents of land for all Harijans in Malabar with an interest free loan of Rs. 300 for construction to be returned in 30 annual instalments;

(11) that the Address has not mentioned the necessity of taking up certain legislative measures regarding Malabar Tenancy, Malabar Marumakkattayam, Malabar education, viz., the private management system, etc.;

(12) that the Address has not mentioned anything about the measures to be adopted by the Government to wipe off the arrears of debt of the peasantry which stands in the way of their active participation in national reconstruction;

(13) that the Address has not mentioned about the alleged eviction of Adivasis in large numbers in Attappady area of Walluvanad taluk with the connivance of landlords and Police; and

(14) that the Address has not mentioned anything about the labour discontent, especially in Feroke and Pappinnisseri areas of Malabar where certain management of factories like the Malabar Tile Works and Western India Cottons, respectively violate the Rules and regulations governing the factories resulting in misery among the workers; and

(15) that the Address has not mentioned that all political prisoners will be ordered to be released in view of the Reorganization of the States."

The amendment was put and lost.

18th August 1956]

MR. SPEAKER : The question is—

Add at the end the following :

“ but regret to note that—

(1) the Address has failed to point out the failure of the Government to grant at least educational concession to the children of Village Officers pending decision on the other grievances and demands made by them;

(2) the Address has not mentioned anything about the grievances of Non-Gazetted Officers of the State and the remedial measures proposed by the Government;

(3) the Address has not mentioned the necessity of constituting an enquiry committee consisting of the members of the Legislature both from Malabar and Tamil areas of the State to enquire into the serious allegations made by responsible persons from Malabar regarding the felling and removal of trees from the forests of Malabar and transfer of valuable machinery and other movables from Malabar on the eve of the Reorganization of States;

(4) the Address has not considered the gravity of the situation arising from the abnormal rise in price of rice and other daily necessities of life affecting the life of the people without any distinction as to whether they live in the villages or in towns and the failure of the Government to open at least one Fair Price Shop in each village despite the representations from the people of Malabar and also from the Food Conference held at Kozhikode recently;

(5) the Address has not mentioned the failure of the Government to take adequate steps for rendering relief to the people affected by the recent flood in Malabar and Kasargod taluk; and

(6) the Address has not mentioned anything about the necessity of immediately amending the Malabar Tenancy Act so that—

(i) the provision for payment of rent be suitably amended in order to safeguard the interests of the tenants;

(ii) rule 3-A of the Fixation of Fair Rent Rules held to be void by a recent decision of the High Court be amended suitably; and

(iii) the procedure adopted by several Rent Courts in Malabar consequent upon a decision of the Ottapalam Sub-Court not to deduct the harvest expenses from the gross produce but to add ten per cent more on the plea that 20 per cent of the produce had been deducted from the produce in classifying lands, be rectified by suitable amendments and other necessary amendments also be made.”

The amendment was put and lost.

[13th August 1956]

MR. SPEAKER: The question is—

Add at the end the following:

“ but regret that mention has not been made in the Address regarding the redress of the grievances of the Non-Gazetted Officers of this State.”

The amendment was put and lost.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is—

Add at the end the following:

“ but regret to note that the Address has not mentioned anything about the failure of Prohibition and the measures to be taken either to work the Prohibition Act successfully or to repeal it; and the steps taken to eradicate corruption and inefficiency in the several departments of Government, the measures to redress the grievances of Non-Gazetted Officers and Village Officers, and the plight of Indians in Ceylon and the attitude of our Government regarding them.”

The amendment was put and lost.

MR. SPEAKER: May I know whether hon. Member Sri K. Vinayakam is withdrawing his amendment?

SRI K. VINAYAKAM: Before I withdraw my amendment I would like to have a little information . . .

MR. SPEAKER: There cannot be any speech at this stage. The Hon. Leader of the House is not likely to give any information or any assurance. If the hon. Member is not withdrawing his amendment, I will put it to the vote of the House.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM: I am not withdrawing the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is—

Add at the end the following:

“ but regret to note—

(1) that no mention is made in the Address about the steps taken to solve the Andhra-Madras border dispute; and

(2) about the failure of the Government to name Madras State as Tamil Nad.”

The amendment was put and lost.

MR. SPEAKER: I will now put the original motion to vote. The question is—

“ That an humble Address be presented to the Governor that the Members of the Madras Legislative Assembly thank him for the Address delivered to the Members of the Legislature on the 8th August 1956.”

The motion was put and carried.

13th August 1956]

MR. SPEAKER: The House will now adjourn for lunch and meet again at 3 p.m.

The House then adjourned for lunch.

(After lunch—3 p.m.)

IV.—GOVERNMENT RESOLUTION.

RATIFICATION OF THE CONSTITUTION (SIXTH AMENDMENT) BILL, 1956.

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: Sir, I beg to move—

“ That this House ratifies the amendments of the Seventh Schedule, Article 269 and Article 286 of the Constitution of India, proposed to be made by the Constitution (Sixth Amendment) Bill, 1956, as passed by the two Houses of Parliament.”

Sir, I am sure the hon. Members would have looked into the Amending Bill. It deals with three matters. The Second Clause deals with the Seventh Schedule to the Constitution. As far as sales tax is concerned, except sales tax with regard to the sale of newspapers, all the other items of sales tax have been allotted to the States. But now, a new item is sought to be added to the Union List after item 92, that is item 92 (a)—tax on the sale or purchase of goods other than newspapers where such sale or purchase takes place in the course of inter-State trade or commerce. Therefore, the Union Government and Parliament get the power to legislate regarding the sales or purchase tax with reference to inter-State trade or commerce.

I am sure hon. Members would have been following the history of the levy of sales tax on inter-State transactions. Till now, they were governed by Article 286 of the Constitution. That Article lays down:

“(1) No law of a State shall impose, or authorize the imposition of, a tax on the sale or purchase of goods where such sale or purchase takes place—

(a) outside the State; or

(b) in the course of the import of the goods into, or export of the goods out of, the territory of India;”

Therefore, if a sale should take place outside the State, naturally any State within whose jurisdiction the sale did not take place, will not have the power to impose, in respect of that sale, any tax. But there is an Explanation to Article 286 (1) which says: “ For the purposes of sub-clause (a), a sale or purchase shall be deemed to have taken place in the State in which the goods have actually been delivered as a direct result of such sale or purchase for the purpose of consumption in that State, notwithstanding the fact that under the general law relating to sale of goods the property in the goods has by reason of such sale or purchase passed

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [13th August 1956]

in another State." That is to say, in deciding whether a particular sale transaction was outside the State or not, they provided an exception here. If that sale was with reference to any article, which was to be delivered in another State for consumption in that State, then in spite of the fact that the sale itself took place outside the State under the Explanation, it should be deemed to be a sale in the State where the delivery has taken place for purposes of consumption. In interpreting the Explanation, divergent views have been expressed even by the highest judicial authorities—High Courts and the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court itself has given two decisions in the matter. In a decision given in 1953, the Supreme Court held that sub-clause (1) (a) of Article 286 and the Explanation in sub-clause (1) prohibited the taxation of a sale involving inter-State elements by all States except the State in which the goods were delivered for the purposes of consumption therein. Therefore, the State in which the goods are delivered for the purpose of consumption could levy the tax, even though the sale transaction itself had taken place outside the State. Now the position arises in which a State has to levy tax on dealers living outside that State in respect of transactions taking place outside that State. The dealers may not have any assets at all in the State which levies the tax. Steps had to be taken by other State Governments for collecting the tax. Therefore, the levy and collection of this tax created a lot of difficulties.

In 1955 this decision of the Supreme Court was reversed. The Supreme Court laid down that even though for certain purposes, a sale shall be deemed to be a sale within the State in which the goods had actually been delivered for consumption, still its character of being an inter-State transaction had not been taken away, and that unless the Parliament specifically authorized the levy of a tax on such transactions under article 286 (2), the State Legislatures had no power to levy the tax. That was the later decision. So much so to-day we are in a position in which neither the State in which the sale takes place nor the State in which the goods are delivered for consumption has got the power to tax. So inter-State transactions are going completely without being taxed. This position has led to considerable evasion of the tax. I am sure hon. Members would have heard about Madras residents going and purchasing motor cars in border States like the Andhra State and the cars being delivered to the purchasers in the Madras State. That sort of transaction is a transaction on which neither the Andhra State nor the Madras State can levy a tax. Motor cars and also other goods were being purchased in this manner. Parliament considered all these aspects and felt that it should have the power to levy the tax so far as inter-State transactions were concerned. To empower the Union Government to levy the tax, it is proposed to add this tax as a new item in the Union List of taxes.

Although the tax on inter-State sales and purchases will be levied and collected by the Union Government, the proceeds of

13th August 1956] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

the tax will not accrue to that Government, but will be divided among the various States in accordance with such principles of distribution as may be formulated by Parliament by law. Article 269 (1) contains a list of the duties and taxes that shall be levied and collected by the Union Government but the proceeds of which shall be assigned to the States. It is proposed to amend that Article by adding to that list the tax on inter-State sales and purchases.

Then there is another amendment and this is a little bit important. After clause (2) of Article 269, the following new clause is added as clause (3) :—

Parliament may by law formulate principles for determining when a sale or purchase of goods takes place in the course of inter-State trade or commerce.

Till now, what is in the course of inter-State trade or commerce has been in a state of flux. There have been various decisions on this topic. Now it has been laid down that only by the test of the last transaction, it will be decided whether a transaction is an inter-State transaction or not and that no other transaction will come within the definition of inter-State transaction. Suppose in a State *A* sells to *B* and *B* sells to *C* who is a person residing in another State. Now the sale by *B* to *C* is necessarily an inter-State transaction. What about the sale by *A* to *B*? It has been held now that that sale will be an intra-State transaction and not an inter-State transaction, because there is no question of the goods passing into another State. But the argument has been put forward that if sale by *A* to *B* was itself with the object of *B* selling to *C* who belongs to another State and that therefore the sale *A* to *B* should also be considered as an inter-State transaction. With regard to import and export trade also, it has been held that only by the test of the last transaction, it will be decided whether a transaction is in the course of export trade or commerce or not. Now Parliament is taking powers for the purpose of defining the principles for determining when a sale or purchase is taking place in a State. It may be that Parliament may set aside the principles of all these decisions and bring in new principles for determining these things. Even though it might be a prior transaction, if the sale was intended to pass the goods to another State and there could have been no possibility of the goods being consumed in the State where the first transaction took place, then the Parliament might say that it should be considered to be a transaction taking place in the course of inter-State trade. Whereas now, in respect of certain transactions, we are entitled to treat them as intra-State transactions and levy tax on them. It might be that Parliament might bring in legislation taking these transactions out and making them inter-State transactions and put a bar on the States levying sales tax. That is the purpose of bringing in entry 92-A and adding one sub-clause to clause (1) of Article 269, and the insertion of a new clause (clause 3) after clause 2.

3-20
P.M.

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[13th August 1956]

We now come to Article 286, clause 3. This clause 3 says—

“ No law made by the Legislature of a State imposing, or authorising the imposition of, a tax on the sale or purchase of any such goods as have been declared by Parliament by law to be essential for the life of the community shall have effect unless it has been reserved for the consideration of the President and has received his assent.”

This is with reference to certain articles which are declared by Parliament as essential commodities. In respect of these articles, no new law levying any sales tax could be passed unless we reserve that Bill for the assent of the President and the assent of the President is obtained. So the power of the legislature in respect of these essential articles is curtailed to that extent. Hon. Members are aware that a law has been passed by Parliament in which certain articles have been declared to be essential articles—foodgrains, medium cloth and woollen articles. The position in respect of old laws for levy of sales tax on these articles was not affected. But in respect of any new law, which any State may contemplate bringing forward in respect of these essential articles, that State will have to reserve that Bill for the assent of the President and they will have to obtain the President's assent to the Bill. Take, for example, Madras. We have levied multi-point sales tax on foodgrains. This is not affected at all. But in a State where food articles have not been taxed already, and that State wants to levy a tax on food articles now (even if it be a small tax), then that State will have to get the assent of the President to the levy of that tax. But we are not in that position. This was further scrutinised by the Taxation Enquiry Commission and they have stated that what article is an essential article and what should not be taxed are matters which should be left to the discretion of the State Governments. They have stated that they should not restrict the powers of the State Governments in regard to the levy of this tax, because what is an essential commodity in a particular area may not be an essential commodity in another area. For example, woollen goods are not essential articles as far as South India is concerned. But in Northern India, where they have severe winter, woollen articles may be essential articles. Then, we have introduced Prohibition here. Therefore no tax is being paid by the poorer section of the people by taking to drinks. But in an area where Prohibition has not become effective, and taxes are collected on the drinks, then the poorer section of people, who resort to these drinks, pay taxes. A State which introduces total Prohibition may come forward with a proposal to levy a tax on foodgrains or other essential commodities which are being used by the poorer section of the people. All these matters should be left to the discretion of the State Governments, and they should take the entire responsibility. These should not be left to Parliament, which is an All-India body with an All-India background, to declare what are essential articles with reference to various States. Parliament has now come to

13th August 1956] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

the conclusion, as a result of the points put forward by the Taxation Enquiry Commission, that clause (3) of Article 286 should be annulled. This is being given effect to. But there are certain other cases where even though the article may not be an essential article, still it may be a raw material which is being used in the manufacturing process in various other States. In this case, if the raw material is taxed by a particular State, then that tax is not being paid by any consumer in that State. That raw material has to necessarily go to another State for the purpose of being used in manufacturing other articles. Therefore, when this raw material is taxed by a particular State and when it is not consumed there, the tax is not borne by the consumers of that State. So by levying sales tax on raw materials which are used in another State for manufacturing other articles, the raw materials producing State levies a tax on the consumer in another State. This is against the principles of levying sales tax. That is why in respect of these essential raw materials, the Taxation Enquiry Commission made the recommendation that Parliament should regulate the levy of sales tax. Having gone into the facts of the case of these various articles, Parliament has now come to the conclusion that it is not necessary to restrict it to raw materials alone but that there should be a general provision. And that is what Parliament proposes to bring in now. This is what new clause (3) says :—

“ Any law of a State shall, in so far as it imposes, or authorises the imposition of, a tax on the sale or purchase of goods declared by Parliament by law to be of special importance in inter-State trade or commerce, be subject to such restrictions and conditions in regard to the system of levy, rates and other incidents of the tax as Parliament may by law specify.”

If by law Parliament specifies any article to be of special importance in inter-State trade or commerce, then we will be subject to the restrictions which may be placed by Parliament. This is the position. Therefore, this goes a little beyond the recommendations of the Taxation Enquiry Commission Report. To-morrow Parliament may by law say that food articles also are commodities of special importance in inter-State trade. In that case, the levy of sales tax on the transactions relating to food articles will be governed by what Parliament lays down. For example, Parliament may say that cloth forms an article of special importance in inter-State trade, because production of cloth takes place only in certain areas, and therefore cloth is of special importance. Then we will be subject to the restrictions which may be imposed by Parliament. But I do not think that we need object to this provision as we are situated. Because, we are the importers of many articles from outside, and particularly if Parliament extends the restriction to food articles also, on the whole we will be the gainers. Therefore, we need not take objection to the widening of the scope of the new sub-clause (3) of article 286. As it is

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[13th August 1956]

proposed, we can agree to the amendments proposed by the Parliament in respect of the Constitution. I am sure the hon. Members would have read with great interest the debate which had taken place in the Parliament, the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha, and they would have noted the essential points. I have also attempted to place before this House the essential points arising out of this measure. I hope the House will give its unanimous support and give its concurrence to this measure.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion moved—

“ That this House ratifies the amendments of the Seventh Schedule, Article 269 and Article 286 of the Constitution of India, proposed to be made by the Constitution (Sixth Amendment) Bill, 1956, as passed by the two Houses of Parliament.”

* SRI B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Motion before the House. In doing so, I must confess that I am not able to understand all the implications that have been broadly mentioned by the Hon. Leader of the House who moved this Resolution. Sales tax is a fairly new branch of law which came into existence for the first time soon after the First World War in 1914 when the French lawyers and legislators invented this and put it in motion. Thereafter, it was copied by Government after Government as it brought a large revenue. In our State, when it was first introduced for the purpose of defraying expenditure consequent on the introduction of Prohibition, it was thought that the revenue from that tax would not be so large. But, later on, one of the predecessors of the present Leader of the House, the then Finance Minister Mr. Gopala Reddy was worshipping this sales tax as Kamadhenu which was yielding lot of money for meeting the expenditure to be incurred on the various schemes that he wanted to put through. This measure of taxation and this branch of law is yet empirical with no scientific basis. I am saying this with a certain amount of responsibility and study in this matter. Sales tax has not been fitted in with the economy of the country, particularly the socialistic pattern that has been envisaged and which is now the target and ideal of the Governments in the country to achieve. Of course, taxation is necessary for the purpose of finding the revenue. Surely, the Government have to get revenue from persons who can afford to pay the taxes. But, to impose the tax upon very, very poor families which are not able to meet the expenses every day or every month is something which cannot be easily reconciled. At the same time, to differentiate between one person and another, subject and subject is no easy matter. It is in that context that this inter-State sales tax has given rise to conflicting principles. But, fortunately, with a view to having a firm pattern consistent with the interests of the States, in order to avoid any escape from the payment of tax, a scheme has been formulated, that has been dealt with by the Parliament and sent to us for ratification. This taxation on sales is primarily, under the Constitution, a subject to be dealt with

13th August 1956] [Sri B. Vaikunta Baliga]

by the State Legislature. What has been attempted by the Parliament is really an invasion into our domain and we cannot lightly bow down to it. It is a matter to be carefully and seriously considered by this House. Personally, I feel that having regard to all the circumstances, if a country is to have a free progress, a certain amount of co-ordination between one State and another is inevitable. I am reminded in this connexion of a story that is constantly mentioned by the villagers in my part of the country. You know the cat shakes its head as many times as there are disturbances. The villages wanted a pedestal to put a lamp and that lamp was sought to be placed over the heads of six cats together which was almost impossible. Similarly, the inter-State tax has come to a stage when it is bristling with so many difficulties that any sort of reconciliation is impossible. Hon. Members must have seen how it was first introduced, and later how an explanation was added to the Madras General Sales Tax. When we see how it has been reviewed by the Judges of the High Court and how it has been dealt with by the Judges of the Supreme Court, it makes us to simply bewilder. The only solution is the present amendment which has been brought forward. At the same time, I cannot say I am very happy. This amendment will not be the last of its kind so long as hurdles are created by the imposition of this tax, as people will still try to get over the hurdles and try to avoid them. But, the enunciation of this principle is expected to work to the entire satisfaction of everybody. We must have a consistent, co-ordinated, well-balanced scheme of taxation in all the States. So far as sales tax is concerned, there has been a disturbed balance. There has been quite a lot of attempts at evasion. The Hon. Leader of the House also pointed out how people bought their motor cars from some other neighbouring States in order to avoid the payment of sales tax. Moreover, the rate of taxation in all the States is not the same. In one State it is higher than the other State. So, the consumer adopts his own ways. Consequently, there is imbalance. This cannot be taken individually. I am feeling that we have reached a stage where we must have scientific and basic principles enunciated and such principles should come into force simultaneously in all the States. But, that is not a matter which could be dealt with by this Legislature. It shall be the endeavour of the Central Government to move in the matter and guide the various States by evolving a sort of uniform principle in all these matters. That again will depend upon the needs of the States and ways for raising the necessary revenue to meet those needs. These are the multiple principles which have to be borne in mind and which should result in the correlation of the needs of the various States. It should be the endeavour of the Central Government to take all these aspects into consideration and evolve uniform principles for a satisfactory, if not an ideal legislation.

So far as the present legislation now before the House is concerned, I must certainly congratulate the Government on bringing

[Sri B. Vaikunta Baliga]

[13th August 1956]

forward such a measure which is an improvement upon the existing sorry state of affairs. There may be a certain amount of hardship. There cannot be retrospective effect. In the interpretation of the various sections, in the swing of the pendulum so to say, a number of merchants, industrialists, shopkeepers and others have been put to certain payments which they need not pay. I am only pointing out how hasty legislation, immature legislation is putting hardship upon the people for which there is no justification. I do therefore wish to say that not only this legislation, but much more in this line will be needed to set matters at rest and to evolve consistent principles in the matter of taxation. Now, Sir, one of the points enunciated in this Bill is that whatever revenue is collected as inter-State sales tax will be distributed among the various States. I do not know whether this matter has been clarified or whether it has got to be clarified only hereafter. There should be clarification as to whether the distribution will be done according to the number of units or the amount collected from each State. There may be some slight difficulty in regard to this matter and it is better that some principle is evolved to the satisfaction of all. It is necessary that this aspect should be clearly understood. I have no doubt that every State will try to protect its own interest. Therefore, it may not be necessary, while dealing with this resolution here, that we should enter into such details. At the same time, such details are necessary. Year after year, large sums of money will be collected from the States and there should be just principles evolved for the equitable distribution of the proceeds. I do feel that sales tax on essential commodities is a standing reproach to all legislation in the State. Essential food articles should be exempted from this tax so that every man is free to buy as much as he wishes to nourish his body and maintain his intelligence.

3-40
p.m. Unless we exempt essential articles, I feel, Sir, that there is a certain amount of moral blame attached to any party in power. In this light, I would appeal to the Government to bring forward a legislation to exempt all essential articles at the earliest available moment. Now, Sir, having made myself clear on this point, I resume my seat thanking the Hon. Speaker and supporting the Motion before the House.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the hon. Member Sri Vaikunta Baliga on the question of essential articles being exempted from taxation of any type whatsoever. But just now we are not in that particular question. The scope of the Constitution (Sixth Amendment) Bill, 1956, that is now before this House is far more restricted. The position at present is that any State which wants to impose sales tax on essential articles should get the prior sanction of the President before the introduction of such a measure on those lines. But what we are now concerned with is that this amending Bill seeks to do away with that provision, viz., the necessity to obtain the prior sanction of the President. Now if a particular

13th August 1956] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

State wants to impose a tax on essential articles, they must take the responsibility themselves. They must know what the consequences are. Of course, our State has already imposed a tax on a number of foodgrains. But we know what happened in Uttar Pradesh. There as soon as the sales tax was imposed on essential commodities, there was a great agitation and the State Government were forced to bend to a certain extent. So, any State which imposes a tax must be fully alive to its responsibility and should not look to the President for assent. In a way it does not affect us. The amendment of the Constitution that is before us first of all, seeks to do with certain conflicting position arisen out of the judgment of the High Court with regard to "what constitutes an inter-State transaction" and all that. To that extent it is a welcome thing. But unfortunately the position is that it is not clear from this amendment as to what constituted an inter-State transaction though "Parliament may by law formulate principles for determining when a sale or purchase of goods takes place in any of the ways mentioned in clause (1) of Article 286 of the Constitution". Therefore, even after the amendment is passed, until the Parliament by statute lays down certain principles, the position will be much worse than what it is to-day and many of the people who have evaded this tax will continue to do so. Sir, it may happen that the Parliament may not be sitting when certain principles would have to be enacted immediately. That means there is going to be a delay in the enactment of such a legislation in the Parliament. To meet such a contingency, I suggest that the Madras Government should recommend to the President or the Central Government that immediately an Ordinance must issue to define these principles so that evasion does not take place.

The second thing which I would like to point out is the vagueness in sub-clause (3) of Article 286 of the Constitution. It says—

"Any law of a State shall, in so far as it imposes, or authorizes the imposition of, a tax on the sale or purchase of goods declared by Parliament by law to be of special importance in inter-State trade or commerce, be subject to such restrictions and conditions in regard to the system of levy, etc. . ."

I do not like the wording of this sub-clause and I do not know whether it would be useful to have it as it is. I look at the country as a whole and looking at it from that point of view, the question is not so simple as the Hon. Minister for Finance has tried to make out. The wording 'to be of special importance in inter-State trade or commerce' is not clear. It is not a question whether a particular article is an important article in inter-State trade or commerce. For example, paddy or rice which is an essential article has got to pass from one State to another State in the course of trade. It may be a very important article of inter-State trade but the wording is not clear in that respect. It is not a question of laying down certain principles with regard to restrictions and conditions in regard to the system of levy, rates and other incidents of the tax. Nobody knows what exactly the phrase 'of special

[Sri P. Ramamurthi]

[13th August 1956]

importance in inter-State trade or commerce' means. If the amendment had been more precise, things would have been far better but unfortunately some of these things are so vague. For instance, what exactly are the principles? What are the articles which are of importance in inter-State trade or commerce? Since they are not defined, the scope of this particular clause is far wider than what is contemplated in the Report of the Taxation Enquiry Commission. I, therefore, suggest that this House and the Government should recommend to the Central Government that this clause must be properly worded so that the intention must be made absolutely clear without giving room for different interpretations. With these words, I support the Motion before the House.

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: Sir, I really welcome the suggestion of the hon. Leader of the Opposition with regard to the necessity to have an early Parliamentary enactment in regard to the principles laid down in the proposed amendment of the Constitution. Unless the Parliament makes law, the amendment of the Constitution by itself does not solve many of the difficulties. No doubt, that will solve difficulties with regard to the judicial interpretation. But with reference to the evasion and the levy of tax on inter-State transaction, action could be taken only after the Parliament makes the necessary enactment. So, even though we may be in a hurry to give our concurrence to the amendment of this Bill and the amendment comes into effect, still the evasion to which I made a reference in the opening speech will go on unabated perhaps on a larger scale. Till the Parliamentary legislation comes into effect, the evaders would like to make hay while the sun shines. Therefore, I welcome the suggestion that if the Parliament cannot immediately bring forward the necessary law, it should be done by the promulgation of an Ordinance. I am sure, the Central Government will take this point into consideration and if necessary this Government also will address the Central Government in respect of this matter so that the Parliamentary enactment may come into effect at as early a date as possible.

As regards sub-clause (3) of Article 286 of the Constitution, I do not see any difficulty in its wording. The wording 'of special importance in inter-State trade or commerce' is quite explicit enough and no other wording can be used. It could only be 'in inter-State trade or commerce' and it cannot be 'to inter-State trade or commerce' or anything else. Therefore, I do not think that is going to cause any difficulty. Once the Parliament says that such and such articles are of special importance in inter-State trade or commerce, there is no fear of that being questioned in any court of law. Therefore, what are the articles which Parliament would consider as being specially important will be the main thing that we have to consider. If only hon. Members can go through the debate in the Parliament they will find that the only articles which would be considered for the present would be raw materials and, if necessary, food articles. But, apart from that, it is open to Parliament to bring in any of the articles but it is not contemplated.

13th August 1956] [Sri C. Subramaniam]

Then, there is the question, whether it is possible to mention all those articles in the Constitution itself. It is not advisable because the pattern of inter-State trade may be changing and we may have to include or exclude some of the articles in which case we should not be put to the necessity of amending the Constitution itself for that purpose. Therefore it is quite proper that in respect of the declaration of the articles it is left to Parliament. Therefore I do not see any difficulty which the Leader of the Opposition tried to point out. 3-50 p.m.

Then Sri Baliga raised another important issue with regard to the levy of sales tax on essential articles and it was sought to be endorsed by the Leader of the Opposition with enthusiasm. The hon. Member does not understand the real significance of levying sales tax on food articles. He seems to think that everybody who consumes food articles is paying sales tax. It is not so. Hon. Members know that 80 to 85 per cent of the population live in rural areas and out of that 70 to 80 per cent of the people are engaged in agricultural operations. As far as they are concerned they do not depend upon the purchase of food articles in open market for the purpose of meeting their own food requirements. An assessment has been made by an expert to find out how much of these food articles produced in the agricultural sector go into the open market for sale so that they may be available for purposes of taxation. An expert authority has assessed that 15 per cent of the food articles produced comes into the open market for sale. Another authority has fixed it at 20 per cent. Anyhow it is between 15 and 20 per cent. In the villages these food articles which come into the open market are sold in petty shops and those shops are not subject to taxation because mostly they do not come minimum turnover clause for the purpose of bringing them into the clutches of sales tax operations. Therefore these petty shops in rural areas do not come into the picture at all. In urban areas shops dealing with foodgrains come into the picture. We are justified in levying this tax on the urban population as against the rural population. There are poor people in urban areas; but when compared to the standards prevailing in rural areas, however poor a person might be in an urban area, he is comparatively better placed than a poor man in a rural area. Therefore, if the principle of taxation has got to be applied in a poor country, then amongst the poor people we have to select the better-placed people. We have selected those people and we are collecting this tax on food articles only from consumers in urban areas. I am prepared to justify this. Let us compare the labour population in the rural areas and the labour population in the urban areas. The income of a labourer in the urban area is four times that of the income of an agricultural labourer. In these circumstances, for the benefit of the people in the rural areas, if we collect this tax from the people living in the urban areas, certainly there is the greatest justification for it. Therefore, let us not delude ourselves by saying that these are essential articles and that therefore these should not be taxed. We should take into consideration

[Sri C. Subramaniam]

[13th August 1956]

who are paying this tax and for the benefit of whom. If these facts are taken into consideration we can easily justify the tax on foodgrains. It is not as if the Madras Government have no heart for the poor people and they are out of fleece all the people. We have gone into the economics, the ethics and the morality of it and we are justified in levying this tax on food articles particularly when the tax comes from the people in the urban areas. As far as the amendment to the Constitution is concerned, this matter is not relevant. But since this point has been put forward with somewhat poignant feeling by Mr. Baliga which was readily endorsed by the Leader of the Opposition, I thought I should answer that.

I hope as far as this resolution is concerned it will be unanimously passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is—

“ That this House ratifies the amendments of the Seventh Schedule, Article 269 and Article 286 of the Constitution of India, proposed to be made by the Constitution (Sixth Amendment) Bill, 1956, as passed by the two Houses of Parliament.”

The Resolution was put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The House will now adjourn and meet again at 9 a.m. to-morrow.

The House then adjourned. (3-55 p.m.)

V.—PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

*41. *Report of the Committee on Public Accounts on the Accounts of the State of Madras for the year 1952-53.*

42. *The Madras Buildings (Lease and Rent Control) Amendment Bill, 1956.*

13th August 1956]

APPENDIX I.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No 2 asked by Sri K. Aranganathan at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 13th August 1956, page 530 supra.]

STATEMENT.

List of middle and high schools in the State, 1955-56.

Name of district.	Number of Middle schools.		Total.	Number of High schools.		Total.
	Boys.	Girls.		Boys.	Girls.	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1 Madras	6	3	9	44	27	71
2 Chingleput	6	6	12	32	5	37
3 South Arcot	4	4	8	33	7	40
4 Tanjore	4	4	8	60	9	69
5 Madurai	7	3	10	40	12	52
6 Ramana hapuram ..	7	1	8	59	11	70
7 Tirunelveli	7	3	10	67	13	80
8 North Arcot	3	3	6	52	9	61
9 Salem	3	1	4	57	5	62
10 Tiruchirappalli ..	17	3	20	58	13	71
11 Coimbatore	14	1	15	74	16	90
12 Nilgiris	1	1	2	12	5	17
13 Malabar	3	3	6	110	18	128
14 South Kanara	1	1	2	55	17	72
Total	83	15	98	753	167	920

STATEMENT.

*List of Colleges—Arts and Professional—1955-56
(including University Departments).*

Name of the district.	Number of Colleges for Arts and Science.		Total.	Number of Colleges for Professional Education.		Total.
	For Men.	For Women.		For Men.	For Women.	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1 Madras	7	5	12	11 (b)	2	13 (b)
2 Chingleput	3	..	3	1	..	1
3 South Arcot	1 (a)	..	1 (a)	3 (c)	..	3 (c)
4 Tanjore	4	..	4	..	..	..
5 Madurai	4	2	6	1	..	1
6 Ramanathapuram ..	3	1	4	2	..	2
7 Tirunelveli	4	2	6	2	..	2
8 North Arcot	3	1	4	2	..	2
9 Salem	1	..	1	1	..	1
10 Tiruchirappalli ..	4	2	6	2	..	2
11 Coimbatore	3	2	5	5	..	5
12 Nilgiris	1	..	1	..	..	..
13 Malabar	5	2	7	1	..	1
14 South Kanara	3	1	4	2	1	3
Total	46	18	64	33	3	36

(a) Refers to the Arts and Science Faculty of the Annamalai University

(b) Includes one Madras University College of Technology.

(c) Includes (1) B.T. Section of the Annamalai University.

(2) Faculty of Engineering of the Annamalai University.

(3) Faculty of Technology of the Annamalai University.

[13th August 1956]

APPENDIX II.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 3 asked by Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 13th August 1956, page 530 supra.]

STATEMENT.

Category.	Total number of officers in the State.	Number of Malayalees among them.
(1)	(2)	(3)
1 District Judge	21	8 (38 per cent)
2 District Magistrate	12	1 (8 per cent)
Subordinate Judges	47	13 (28 per cent)
Presidency Magistrate in the category of Subordinate Judges.	2	Nil.
3 District Munsifs and Presidency Magistrates in the cadre of District Munsifs.	133	33 (25 per cent)
Subdivisional Magistrates	23	4 (17 per cent)

APPENDIX III.

[Vide answer to unstarred question No. 4 asked by Sri V. R. Krishna Ayyar at the meeting of the Legislative Assembly held on 13th August 1956, page 530 supra.]

STATEMENT.

District Munsifs' Courts and Sub-Courts in Malabar.

I. NORTH MALABAR.

Courts that existed on 31st March 1956.

Additional Courts sanctioned since 31st March 1956.

*District Munsifs' Courts.**District Munsifs' Courts.*

1 District Munsif, Badagara.	
2 Do. Cannanore.	
3 Do. Kuthuparamba.	1 Additional District Munsif, Kuthuparamba.
4 Do. Nadapuram.	2 Additional District Munsif, Nadapuram.
5 Do. Payyoli.	3 Additional District Munsif, Payyoli.
6 Do. Quilandy.	
7 Do. Taliparamba.	
8 Do. Tellicherry (Principal).	
9 Do. Tellicherry (Additional).	

*Sub-Courts.**Sub-Courts.*

1 Subordinate Judge, Tellicherry (Principal).
2 Do. Tellicherry (Additional).

13th August 1956]

District Munsifs' Courts and Sub-Courts in Malabar—cont.

II. SOUTH MALABAR.

Courts that existed on 31st March 1956.

Courts sanctioned since 31st March 1956.

*District Munsifs' Courts.**District Munsifs' Courts.*

1 District Munsif, Alathur.

- | | | |
|----|-----|-------------------------|
| 2 | Do. | Kozhikode (Principal). |
| 3 | Do. | Kozhikode (Additional). |
| 4 | Do. | Walluvanad. |
| 5 | Do. | Manjeri. |
| 6 | Do. | Ottapalam. |
| 7 | Do. | Parappanangadi. |
| 8 | Do. | Ponnani. |
| 9 | Do. | Tirur. |
| 10 | Do. | Chowghat. |
| 11 | Do. | Palghat. |

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| 1 | Additional District Munsif, |
| | Kozhikode. |
| 2 | Additional District Munsif, |
| | Walluvanad. |

*Sub-Courts.**Sub-Courts.*

(1)

(2)

- | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| 1 | Subordinate Judge, Kozhikode. | 1 | Additional Subordinate Judge, |
| | | | Kozhikode. |
| 2 | Do. Ottapalam. | 2 | Do. Ottapalam. |
| 3 | Do. Palghat. | | |
| 4 | Do. Fort Cochin. | | |

NOTE.—The additional Courts have been sanctioned on a temporary basis to reduce pendency. With a view to give relief to the Principal and Additional District Munsif, already functioning at Kozhikode an additional District Munsif has been sanctioned for the Principal District Munsif's Court at Kozhikode. The Additional District Munsif sanctioned for Walluvanad is intended to give relief to the District Munsif at Ottapalam also. The additional District Munsif sanctioned to Payyoli will, if necessary, give relief to the District Munsif at Quilandy.

வாய்மையே வெல்லும்
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

